INTRODUCTION TO THE THEOLOGICAL SUMMA OF ST. THOMAS

GRABMANN-ZYBURA

208.67
G 752

INTRODUCTION TO THE THEOLOGICAL SUMMA OF ST. THOMAS

BY

DR. MARTIN GRABMANN

of the University of Munich

AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION
FROM THE SECOND, REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION
OF THE ORIGINAL GERMAN

BY

JOHN S. ZYBURA, PH.D.

Author of *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*, etc.

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1930

2003

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 15. Sept., 1930,

F. J. Holweck,

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 16. Sept., 1930,

✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*

Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1930

BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Dr. Grabmann's long and illustrious career as a research scholar of Scholastic sources, particularly his profound knowledge of the history, content, and spirit of the *Summa Theologica*, make him exceptionally competent to introduce us to that masterpiece of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The indefatigable labors of the eminent savant have yielded a rich harvest of highly important books and articles, all bearing witness to his erudition, thoroughness, and critical acumen. To-day he is probably the foremost authority in his chosen field of research.

In the present work Dr. Grabmann accomplishes four things:

He sets forth the historical origin of the *Summa Theologica*, its place among the works of the prince of Scholastics, and the influence it has exerted down to our day.

In a historical commentary on the Prologue to the *Summa* he initiates us into the spirit and form of this monumental work; with the intellectual life of Scholasticism and Thomas' way of thinking and

working as a background, he outlines and estimates the originality of method and content as well as the power and value of this greatest literary creation of Aquinas.

He then shows its significance for to-day by stimulating reflections on the proper manner of interpreting and utilizing it.

In a final chapter he unfolds the structure of the entire work, gives a summary of its contents, and adds illuminating comments on the outstanding excellences of its several parts.

This *Introduction*, then, is neither a mere abstract nor an apology of Thomism. It is a scientific, historical, and practical treatise, enabling us to realize what the theological *Summa* is, to appraise it at its true value, and to study it with the greatest possible profit.

Upon these facts is founded the hope that this English version of Dr. Grabmann's excellent *Introduction* will be welcomed by the growing number of those who show an increasing interest for Scholastic thought in general, and for Thomism in particular.

JOHN S. ZYBURA

St. Francis Hospital,
Colorado Springs, Colo.,
May 15, 1930.

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

As my Introduction to the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas, first published in 1919, has been out of print for several years, a new edition has become necessary. In the meantime, the book has been done into French and Dutch. Professor E. Vansteenberghe of Strasbourg, who made the French translation, enriched it with valuable notes, consisting chiefly of bibliographic additions. In other countries, too, Introductions to the theological *Summa* have appeared. A. Masnovo's *Introduzione alla Somma teologica di San Tommaso d'Aquino* (Turin, 1919) elucidates especially its systematic and architectonic aspects. The brochure by C. Le Grand, *L'Enseignement de la Somme théologique dans les Séminaires* (Paris, 1922), contains practical hints for using the *Summa theologica* as a text-book in theological institutions. The more extensive work of Msgr. A. Legendre, *Introduction à l'étude de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1923), is an enthusiastic and expert presentation of the biblical, patristic, and

speculative elements of the *Summa* and of its plan and structure; moreover, it gives directions based on a rich experience, for the study [1] of this supreme achievement of Scholasticism. The somewhat older work of the noted Dante scholar, J. Berthier, O.P., *L'Étude de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1905), will still be found quite useful, particularly because of its detailed unfoldment of the structure of the *Summa Theologiae*.

I have revised and enlarged my *Introduction* in many places, particularly in the literary-historical expositions concerning the genesis of the theological *Summa*, its place in Thomistic literature as to time and content, and its subsequent historical influence. I have also considerably amplified the section on the historical interpretation of the *Summa* and emphasized this point of view even more strongly than in the first edition. My book aims not only to serve didactic purposes, but also to act as an incentive to scientific investigation and exposition of individual points and aspects of the *Summa*. It was also with this end in view that the most important works evincing progress in this direction were selected from the abundant literature of recent years, called forth particularly by the anniversary

[1] Cfr. also, Olgiati-Zybura, *The Key to the Study of St. Thomas* (St. Louis and London, 2nd ed., 1929). (Tr.)

of St. Thomas. The concluding chapter on the structure of the theological *Summa* is entirely new.

May the book in this revised and enlarged form help to promote understanding and love for that work of Aquinas in which his pure and rich mind is most limpidly and beautifully mirrored.

THE AUTHOR

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	LITERARY-HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS . .	1
II.	SPIRIT AND FORM OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA* OF ST. THOMAS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF MEDIEVAL SCHOLASTICISM	60
	I. The *Prologus* in General	60
	II. The Aim of the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas	66
	III. The Ways and Means for Realizing the Aim of the *Summa Theologica*.	
	1. Avoidance of Superfluous Questions, Articles, and Arguments.—Perfection of the Scholastic Method of Exposition	72
	2. Avoidance of Intricacy and Confusion in the Arrangement of the Subject-Matter.—External and Internal Systematization of the *Summa Theologica*	88
	3. Avoidance of Repetitions.—Novelty and Progress in the Theological *Summa*	117
	IV. Influence of the *Summa Theologica*.—Its Religious Character	128

CHAPTER PAGE

III. The Exposition and Utilization of the Theological *Summa* of St. Thomas . . 138

I. Method of Interpreting the *Summa Theologica* 138

II. Utilization of the *Summa Theologica* . 161

IV. Structure of the *Summa Theologica* . . . 178

I. The *Prima* 178

The Treatise on the One God, or on the Divine Essence 179

The Treatise on the Trinity 181

The Treatise on God the Creator . . . 182

II. The *Secunda* 185

1. The *Prima Secundae* 187

The Treatise on Human Acts . . . 188

The Interior and Exterior Principles of Human Acts 190

2. The *Secunda Secundae* 194

The Special Treatise on Virtues. The Theological Virtues 196

The Moral (Cardinal) Virtues and their Ramifications 198

The Treatise on the States and Kinds of Life 203

III. The *Tertia* 204

The Treatise on Jesus Christ, the Saviour 205

The Treatise on the Sacraments . . 209

Index 213

Chapter I

LITERARY-HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

I. THE THEOLOGICAL *SUMMAE* IN GENERAL

In medieval Scholasticism the systematic exposition of the whole of theology was called *Sentences* or *Summa.*[1] In early Scholasticism, inaugurated and established in the twelfth century by St. Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109), the term *Sententiae*, *Liber Sententiarum* is the more common one, while the Scholastics of the thirteenth century prefer the name *Summa*, *Summa in theologia*, for the complete theological synthesis.

Originally the term *Sententiae* designates sen-

[1] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* Vol. II, (Freiburg, 1911), pp. 21–24. On the concept *Sententiae* cfr. J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Paris, 1914), p. 75 sq. On the concept *Summa* see also R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* Vol. III (2nd and 3rd ed., Leipsic, 1913), p. 320. There is an older monograph by J. Simler, *Des sommes de théologie* (Paris, 1871). On the meaning and development of medieval *Summae* in the framework of the medieval world-view, see A. Dempf, *Die Hauptform der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung* (Munich, 1925).

tences, theses, questions, and treatises taken from the Fathers, theologians, collections of canons, and grouped under determinate viewpoints. During the patristic period *Sentences* were compiled by Prosper of Aquitaine, Isidore of Seville, and Tajus of Saragossa. In the twelfth century the sayings and teachings of the Fathers were selected from their writings and brought together in compendia which were called *Sentences, Liber Sententiarum.* In a collection of *Sentences* compiled between 1121 and 1141, this purpose was expressed as follows:[2] "Ut ex diversis praeceptis et doctrinis Patrum excerperem et in unum colligerem eos flores quos solemus quasi singulari nomine sententias appellare."

The first works of *Sentences* were composed in a rather positive form by Anselm of Laon (d.1117)[3] and William of Champeaux (d. 1121). A more speculative and partly contemplative manner characterizes the principal theological work of Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), *De Sacramentis Fidei Christianae.* To him is also ascribed a *Summa Sen-*

[2] B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus,* Vol. IV (Augsburg, 1723), pp. III–IV; J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique,* p. 83; and *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* X (1909), p. 200, note 10.

[3] Fr. Bliemetzrieder, *"Anselms von Laon systematische Sentenzen,"* in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,* XVIII (Münster, 1919), 2–3.

tentiarum, whose authorship has not yet been fully established (Hugh of Mortagne? Odo of Lucca?). The *Theologia* of the philosopher Peter Abélard (d. 1142), an unfinished work, is a system of sacred science with a dialectic turn. The influence of Abélard is felt in the *Sentences* of Master Roland, later Pope Alexander III, and in those of Master Omnebene.

The most voluminous and perhaps the most important collection of *Sentences* of the twelfth century is the as yet unpublished work of Robert of Melun (d. 1167).[4] The book of *Sentences* most widely used is that of Peter the Lombard (d. 1164), *Libri Quattuor Sententiarum*, which during the following centuries served as a handbook of dogmatic theology in theological schools and formed the subject of innumerable commentaries. The *Sentences* of Gandulphus [5] and those of Peter of Poitiers (d. 1205) are dependent on Peter the Lombard. From the school of Gilbert de la Porrée (d. 1154) we have the anonymous *Sententiae Divinitatis*, edited by B. Geyer, and the unpublished *Speculum Universale* of Radulfus Ardens. During this period the term *Summa* was gradually adopted to designate expositions of the whole

[4] An edition is being prepared by R. Martin, O.P.

[5] *Magistri Gandulphi Bononiensis Sententiarum Libri Quattuor*. Ed. Joannes de Walter (Vienna, 1927).

of theology. Thus Peter Cantor (d. 1197) and Cardinal Robert of Courçon (d. 1218) wrote theological *Summae*, still unpublished and treating mainly of moral and sacramental doctrine.

A *Summa* is a more original systematic abridgement of the subject-matter of a given science. Whereas *Sententiae* is preferably the title of dogmatic works, *Summa* denotes the epitomized exposition of various disciplines. Robert of Melun remarks: "Quid enim summa est? Nonnisi singulorum brevis comprehensio?" (Cod. Brug. 191 fol. 1). As early as the twelfth century canonical works, dealing for the most part with the Decree of Gratian, were called *Summae* (for example, the *Summa* of Rufinus, Roland, Stephen of Tournai). Likewise, alphabetical works or dictionaries on the Bible (e. g., the *Summa Abel* of Peter Cantor), treatises on homiletics (e. g., the *Summa de arte praedicatoria* of Alanus de Insulis), casuistic works for the use of confessors (*Summa de Poenitentia* of St. Raymond of Peñafort, O.P., the *Summa Confessorum* of John Lector, O.P., of Freiburg), compendia of grammar and logic (*Summa grammaticalis* of John of Dacia, *Summa de modis significandi, Summa Logices* of Peter of Spain, etc.), moral-ascetical works (*Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* of John de Rupella, O.F.M., of

William Peraldus, O.P.), liturgical works (*Summa de officiis*), apologetico-polemical works (*Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses* of the Dominican Moneta)—all these and other kinds of literature were designated by the term *Summa*. A *Summa de philosophia*, inspired by William of Conches and composed by Master Radulfus, is preserved in manuscript. So, too, in the Arabian philosophy (Avicenna) the title *Summa* (Kullun) was used to denote general treatises on philosophy.

About the year 1200 the designation *Summa* appeared in place of *Sententiae, Libri Sententiarum*, for systematic expositions of speculative theology. The theological *Summae* of Martin of Cremona, Peter of Capua (d. after 1219), Simon of Tournai (circa 1216), Praepositinus of Cremona[6] (d. cira 1230) were for the most part composed in Paris. These theological *Summae*, all as yet unpublished, are expositions of theology with the aid of Aristotelian logic and, in part at least, prepare the method and technique applied in the *Summa* of St. Thomas.

During the first half of the thirteenth century various factors were paving the way for the approach of a new era of Scholasticism, which

[6] G. Lacombe, *Praepositini Cancellarii Parisiensis* (1206–1210) *Opera Omnia*. I.—*La vie et les oeuvres de Prévostin*, Le Saulchoir (1927).

reached its period of maturity, or its golden age [7] in the second half of the same century. The first of these factors was the rise and development of the universities, particularly of the University of Paris, which Albert the Great calls the *Civitas philosophorum.* The second significant factor preparing the rise of a greater Scholasticism in the thirteenth century was the tremendous energy with which the newly founded Orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis entered into the scientific activities of the day. Both Orders early obtained chairs in the University of Paris, to which they appointed their best theologians. The third and doubtless the most effective propelling factor was the discovery of the principal philosophical writings of Aristotle on metaphysics, physics, psychology, natural history, ethics, politics, and rhetoric. They entered the intellectual horizon of western Scholasticism in Latin translations, made partly from the Arabian, partly from the Greek.[8]

[7] Cfr. the exceedingly rich and suggestive exposition in M. de Wulf's *History of Mediaeval Philosophy* (tr. by Messenger, New York, 1925), Vol. I, pp. 235–270.

[8] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristotelesübersetzungen des 13. Jahrhunderts,* in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,* herausgeg. von Cl. Baeumker, XVII (Münster, 1916), p. 5–6.—M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* pp. 237 sqq., where the question of the attitude towards Aristotle and of the translations of his works is thoroughly treated by A. Pelzer.—Ueberweg-Geyer, *Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie* (11th ed., Berlin, 1928), pp. 343–351.

At the same time the commentaries on Aristotle by Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius, Simplicius, and many others were also translated. To this was added the knowledge of the Arabian-Jewish literature on philosophy and the natural sciences, and a series of neoplatonic source-materials. The circle of the known patristic works, especially those of the Greek Fathers, was likewise considerably widened through translations. It it obvious that all these causes had of necessity to exert the most lasting influence on the fashioning and finishing of the theological *Summae*. In particular, the now accessible works of Aristotle most powerfully widened and re-enforced the philosophical substructure of theological speculation, while at the same time enriching the doctrinal edifice of theology with new architectonic motives.

To the period of transition, during which the new sources begin to flow gradually into the Scholastic current, belong the theological *Summae* of William of Auxerre (d. after 1231), Philip of Grève (d. 1236), Godfrey of Poitiers, and the two Dominicans John of Treviso and Roland of Cremona,[9] the latter the first Friar Preacher to be-

[9] Fr. Cardinal Ehrle, *S. Domenico, le origini del primo studio generale del suo ordine a Parigi e la Somma teologica del primo maestro Rolando da Cremona,* in *Miscellanea Domenicana* (Rome, 1923), pp. 85–134.

come professor at the University of Paris. With the exception of the *Summa Aurea* of William of Auxerre, all these *Summae* have remained unpublished, though all, especially that of Roland of Cremona, are of great value.

The imposing *Summa Theologiae* of Alexander of Hales, O.F.M. (d. 1245), belongs to the golden age of Scholasticism. Like most of the preceding *Summae* it remained unfinished until a critical new edition of it began to be published at Quaracchi a few years ago. About the same time as the *Doctor Irrefragabilis*, Albert the Great, O.P. (d. 1280), wrote his *Summa de Creaturis*, of which two parts were hitherto known and published; now three additional parts (*De virtutibus*, *De sacramentis*, *De resurrectione et novissimis*) have been discovered.[10] Later on Albert the Great also wrote a *Summa Theologica* which he left unfinished. A very extensive and deeply speculative *Summa*, the publication of which is being prepared by D. Dagouillon, was written by Albert's pupil, Ulric of Strasburg, O.P. (d. 1277). Other theo-

[10] On these parts of the *Summa de creaturis* which I have identified, see my work, *Drei unpedruckte Teile der Summa de creaturis Alberts d. Gr.*, in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens*, published by P. v. Loe and H. Wilms, Heft 18 (Leipsic, 1919).

logical *Summae* were composed by Henry of Ghent (d. 1293) and Gerard of Bologna, O. Carm. (d. 1317). Both works are incomplete and the *Summa* of the latter, which closely follows the order of the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, still remains unpublished.[11] In Germany, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, theological *Summae* were also written by the Dominicans John of Lichtenberg (d. circa 1313) and Nicholas of Strasburg (d. after 1329).[12] The *Summa* of the latter was discovered by me in an anonymous Vatican manuscript. The fourteenth century witnessed the end of the theological *Summae*, those towering monuments of the period when Scholasticism was in flower.

It was necessary to present a brief sketch of the process of development undergone by the theological *Summae*, so as to find the historical milieu and framework in which can be set the most perfect and most valuable of all the theological *Summae*, the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

[11] Cfr. B. Xiberta, O. Carm., *De Summa Theologica Magistri Gerardi Bononiensis* (Rome, 1923).

[12] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Neu aufgefundene lateinische Werke deutscher Mystiker*, in *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1922).

II. ORIGIN OF THE THEOLOGICAL *SUMMA* OF ST. THOMAS. ITS PLACE AMONG THE LITERARY PRODUCTIONS OF THE AUTHOR

In order to understand the *Summa Theologica* historically and to grasp the method followed by its commentators, it is both useful and important to return it to its place, in what concerns origin, aim, and significance, within the series of works written by St. Thomas, and so to view and appraise it in the *ensemble* of Thomistic writings. The oft-quoted and apposite dictum of the great Thomist, A. Massoulié, "*Divus Thomas sui interpres*," is thus given a historical basis.

Before setting the *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas in its proper place within the chronological series of the works of this indefatigable writer, we must undertake an important classification of these works. For in the writings of St. Thomas we draw a distinction between those which resulted from his academic activity, that is, those which first formed the subject of his lectures, originated in the classroom, and were subsequently published by him; and those which did not arise directly from his teaching of theology. Of course, in the latter writings, too, he has mostly the scientific advancement of his pupils in view; though these

writings did not take their origin from and in the school, none the less they were written in large part for the school.

The activity of St. Thomas as professor of theology comprised the *lectio* and the *quaestio*. The "lesson" or lecture is the explanation of a textbook in the classroom. As *baccalaureus sententiarius* of the theological faculty at the Paris University, St. Thomas thus explained the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard and committed this *lectura* to writing in his *Commentary on the Sentences*. As master of theology he was obliged to explain the books of Holy Writ in his academic *lectio*, and so his commentaries on Sacred Scripture are the rich literary fruit of his brilliant teaching as *magister*, as professor in ordinary of theology.[13]

In medieval theological instruction the *quaestio* came to the fore during the exercises in disputation which the professor arranged with his pupils. Here we must distinguish between the *Disputationes ordinariae* and their literary redaction, the *Quaestiones disputatae* on the one hand, and the *Disputationes quodlibetales* and their commitment to writing in the *Quaestiones quodlibetales* on the other. The latest publications of P. Mandonnet,

[13] Cfr. H. Denifle, *"Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie dans l'Université à Paris,"* in *Revue Thomiste* 2 (1894), pp. 149–162.

A. Pelzer, Fr. Pelster, Destrez, etc., throw light on the manner in which these exercises were conducted, though all details have not yet been made clear.[14] The most important in their subject-matter and most frequent were the *Disputationes ordinariae*. Every master held them several times a year at various intervals and in close connnection with the lectures: at the Paris University during the thirteenth century the number of these disputations was not definitely fixed. The characteristic feature of the *Disputationes ordinariae* consists in the fact that weighty, difficult, and related themes, often representing a large and uni-

[14] P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Chronologie des Questions disputées de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*. Extrait de la *Revue Thomiste* 1918 (Toulouse, 1918), pp. 8–10. On the *Quodlibeta* see also R. Janssen, O.P., *De Quodlibetalia des hl. Thomas v. Aquin* (Bonn, 1912) and A. Pelzer, *Livres de philosophie et de théologie de Tabbaye de Ter Doest à l'usage du maître cistercien Jean Sinderwint de 1411 à 1416* (Bruges, 1918), pp. 28 sq. Fr. Pelster, S.J., "*Thomas von Sutton O.P., ein Gegner der thomistischen Lehre*," in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 46 (1922), p. 368 sqq. Destrez, O.P., *Les disputes quodlibétiques de S. Thomas d'après la tradition manuscrite*, in *Mélanges Thomistes*. Le Saulchoir, 1923, pp. 48–108. Cfr. also M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 254–259. P. Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320*, in *Bibliothèque thomiste* 5 (1925), Le Saulchoir. M. Grabmann, *Studien über Johannes Quidort von Paris*, in *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1922.—Much light will be thrown on the technique of the disputations by Cardinal Ehrle's edition of the statutes of the theological faculty of Bologna for the year 1365: they are modeled on the curriculum of the University of Paris.

form complex of questions, were discussed with all the thoroughness and depth of Scholastic research. On such a comprehensive subject many *disputationes ordinariae* could be arranged, sometimes extending over several years.

The procedure of a single disputation which lasted for two days, was as follows: On the first day, with the *magister* presiding, his *baccalaureus* was called upon to answer the arguments and difficulties (*argumenta, objectiones*) raised on the proposed question by the *magistri, baccalaurei,* and *scholares* present at this solemn academic function. On the second day the *magister* himself took an active part in the proceedings; he put in order and grouped the arguments and objections brought forward on the preceding day of disputation, and advanced against them as a "*Sed contra*" short arguments, drawn from reason and authority, which in a general way announced his own solution of the problem. The *magister* then undertook this independent solution of the question in a detailed and thorough fashion by entering into the historical and speculative connections and presuppositions, formulating his own definitive answer and substantiating it in all its bearings. This decision of the question by the *magister* himself was termed *determinatio magistralis.*

On the basis of this decision the *magister* finally disposed of the objections against it. The *Quaestiones disputatae* are the redaction or protocol of such *disputationes ordinariae.*

Twice a year, as a rule, before Christmas during Advent, and before Easter during Lent, were held exercises in disputation on a variety of subjects. They were called *Disputationes de quolibet* or *Disputationes quodlibetales* (*de natali, de pascha*). They differed from the *Disputationes ordinariae* in that they dealt with diverse unrelated questions and did not enter so deeply into the problems; it is true, however, that subsequently they were frequently arranged in a loose superficial order under the editorship of the *magister.* The *Quodlibeta* are the literary redaction of these *Disputationes quodlibetales.*

I have dwelt at some length on these forms of the *disputatio* and *quaestio* because this facilitates the understanding of the technique of exposition used in the *Summa Theologica,* of which we shall treat later on, and because it helps us to appraise more accurately the connection between the theological *Summa* and the *Quaestiones disputatae.*

The content of his other works which we can bring together into a second group, was not de-

livered nor developed by St. Thomas from the professor's chair; at bottom these works are exclusively literary productions. To this class belong his *Commentaries on Aristotle*, his *Opuscula*, and above all his two *Summae*, the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologica*. However, in the composition of these works, too, he did not lose sight of the scientific needs of his pupils; for with his whole soul and a generous predilection he devoted himself to academic teaching, of which he had such a high idea. He composed the *Summa contra Gentiles* at the request of one of his Dominican confrères, St. Raymond of Peñafort; it was intended for the missionary schools which the Dominicans had established in Spain to educate preachers for missionary work among the Moors and Jews.[15] We shall also see that the *Summa Theologica*, while not expounded in school, was none the less written for students of theology.

After this general classification of the writings of St. Thomas, let us proceed to consider *the place of the theological Summa among the literary productions of Aquinas*. We cannot here undertake to establish an exact list of the genuine writings of

[15] Cfr. M. Grabmann, "*Die Missionsidee bei den Dominikanertheologen des 13. Jahrhunderts*," in *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, I (1911), pp. 140 sqq.

St. Thomas—a task we have attempted elsewhere.[16] Nor is it incumbent upon us to settle in detail the chronology of his works. The solution of these chronological questions, to be considered at another time, is not an easy matter. The most valuable help in this regard, namely, the indication of the date and place of origin in the manuscripts, is found only in some *Quodlibeta*, in the *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, and in the treatise *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*. We shall examine this matter more closely elsewhere. Other indications—not always sure, it is true—are found in the oldest catalogues of the writings of St. Thomas. So, too, we can broadly infer the time of composition from the persons to whom the several works are dedicated. In like manner, quotations from works of which the Latin translation is dated can be used as a *terminus a quo* for determining the time of composition. This time may also be relatively fixed from the internal reference of one work to another and hence an earlier one.[17]

[16] *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, XXII (Münster, 1924). 1 and 2. Cfr. Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Fribourg, 1910). On the life of St. Thomas, see what has been reliably established by P. Angelus Walz, O.P., in his book, *Delineatio vitae S. Thomae de Aquino* (Rome, 1927).

[17] On the chronology of the life and works of St. Thomas

Here we are concerned solely with discovering and bringing out the main links which connect the theological *Summa* with other important works of St. Thomas. By entering the life and writings of his beloved teacher in the consecutive pontificates, Ptolemy of Lucca, the most historically minded pupil of St. Thomas, supplied a chronological division along the main lines, which, however, offers various difficulties. Without going into details, we shall accompany St. Thomas in his literary activities by following the stages of his academic teaching, so as to set his theological *Summa* in its proper place.

His first sojourn in Paris (1252–1259) is divided into two parts: the period of his baccalaureate (1252–1256) and that of his activity as *magister* (1256–1259). As bachelor (*magister nondum existens*) he reduced the metaphysics of being to the simplest expression in his work *De ente et essentia* and thus furnished a prologue, as it were, to his whole scientific activity.[18] The opuscules *De principiis naturae* and

cfr. Mandonnet, *"Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas,"* in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* 1920, pp. 132–152. Also, Fr. Scandone, *La vita, la famiglia e la patria di S. Tommaso,* in *S. Tommaso, Miscellanea storico-artistica* (Rome, 1924), pp. 1–110.

[18] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* (Munich, 1926), pp. 314–331; M. D. Roland-Gosselin, O.P., *Le De Ente*

De natura materiae et dimensionibus interminatis were composed at the same time and develop the fundamental metaphysical concepts of his natural philosophy with an Aristotelian bent. On the threshold of his literary production there stands also the work, *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum* (1256), a defense of his ideal of the religious life against William of St. Amour; considerably later, during his second sojourn in Paris, this was followed by two other writings, *De perfectione vitae spiritualis* against Gerard of Abbeville (1269), and *Contra retrahentes a religionis ingressu* against Nicholas of Lisieux (1270). The principal work composed during his baccalaureate is his *Commentary on the Sentences*, which was probably written between 1253–1255. The mature fruit of his activity as *magister* at the Paris University, 1256–1259, are the *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate.*

In 1259 St. Thomas returned to his native Italy and continued his unflagging labors at the court of Urban IV (1261–1264).[19] He now wrote his *Summa contra Gentiles*, the Office for the Feast of

et essentia de S. Thomas d'Aquin, in *Bibliothèque Thomiste*, 8 (1926), Le Saulchoir.

[19] Cfr. P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Thomas d'Aquin, Lecteur à la Curie Romaine, Chronologie du séjour (1259–1268)*, in *Xenia Thomistica*, Vol. III (Rome 1925), pp. 9–40.

Corpus Christi, the *Opusculum contra errores Graecorum*, the *Catena aurea*, of which he finished the commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew in time to dedicate it to Urban IV, while he dedicated the commentary on St. Mark to his friend Cardinal Annibaldus de Annibaldis. According to Ptolemy of Lucca, the commentary on Job was likewise written during the years of his residence at the court of Urban IV in Orvieto. Perhaps already then there lived at the court of Urban IV the Flemish Dominican and linguist, William of Moerbeke, who as early as 1259 had translated from Greek into Latin Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, and in the spring of 1260, the Stagirite's *Meteorologica* with the commentaries of Alexander of Aphrodisias. We are led to this conjecture by references made by St. Thomas in his *Summa contra Gentiles* (Book II, ch. 61) to Greek copies ("*exemplaria graeca*") of Aristotle's work *De Anima*. Possibly during his stay at the papal court in Orvieto St. Thomas also wrote his commentaries on the *Nicomachaean Ethics*, the Physics, *De Anima*, *De Sensu et Sensato*, and *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*.

The provincial chapter of Anagni (September 8, 1265) appointed St. Thomas director of studies of the Order in the monastery of St.

Sabina on the Aventine in Rome. The Saint held this post during the academic year 1265–1266, and perhaps also during the following year, 1266–1267. He was then called to the court of Clement IV at Viterbo. William of Moerbeke, who was also there as papal penitentiary, in 1268 translated the Στοιχείωσις Θεολογικὴ of Proclus, of which St. Thomas made use in his commentaries on *De Caelo et Mundo*, on the *Liber de Causis* as well as in his work *De Substantiis Separatis*. If we may believe the account of Ptolemy of Lucca, in Rome St. Thomas wrote the first book of a second commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, which has been lost. Quite likely he did not continue this second commentary on the *Sentences* because his plan for the composition of the theological *Summa* was nearing maturity. With the data so far at our disposal it is impossible to determine accurately where and when the single parts of the theological *Summa* were written; we shall have to rest satisfied with drawing boundary lines which will at least broadly determine the chronology of this Thomistic masterpiece. Ptolemy of Lucca gives the following data:[20] Thomas wrote the *Summa* during the time of

[20] *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, lib. 22, cap. 39 and lib. 23, cap. 11. Cfr. Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (2nd ed., Fribourg, 1910), pp. 60 sq.

Clement IV (February 2, 1265 to November, 1268). Immediately thereafter he remarks: "*Istius ergo Summae tres partes quasi scripsit tempore Pontificis et vacationis sequentis, quod fuit spatium duorum annorum et novem mensium.*" Here he extends the time of composition of the theological *Summa* over the pontificate of Clement IV and the following vacancy, which lasted from November, 1268 to September 1, 1271.

Later on, when treating of the pontificate of Gregory X, Ptolemy supplements: "*Hic Doctor tempore huius Pontificis [Gregorii X] scripsit ultimam partem Summae, quae Sacramentalis vocatur, quia de sacramentis ibidem agitur et de incarnatione Verbi, in qua articuli fidei continentur secundum ipsius humanitatem, sed non complevit morte praeventus.*" This allows an interval extending from 1265 until about the time of the Saint's death.

William of Tocco relates a trait from the life of St. Thomas which enlightens us concerning the place where the theological *Summa* was composed. It refers to the absent-mindedness of St. Thomas and his absorption in scientific problems while dining with Louis IX of France: totally oblivious of his surroundings, the thinker struck the table with his hand and exclaimed: "*Modo conclusum*

est contra haeresim Manichaei!" In a previous remark William of Tocco [21] states that St. Thomas had begged to be excused from accepting the King's invitation to dinner, "*propter opus Summae in Theologia, quod dictaret tunc temporis.*" Hence, according to this account of his pupil and biographer, St. Thomas worked on his *Summa* in Paris during the years 1268–1270, because in 1270 St. Louis set out on a crusade and died in the summer of the same year.

Still in another place William of Tocco mentions the theological *Summa* in connection with a local reference. After relating the Saint's vision in the chapel of St. Nicholas in the church of S. Domenico Maggiore at Naples (where St. Thomas heard these words issuing from a crucifix: "*Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma, quam recipies a me pro tuo labore mercedem?*"), William of Tocco adds: [22] "*Et tunc scribebat tertiam partem Summae de Christi passione et resurrectione.*" Accord-

[21] *Guilelmi de Tocco Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis,* cap. 43. Ed. D. Pruemmer (Toulouse, 1913), p. 116. On this biography see Fr. Pelster, *"Die älteren Biographien des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* 44 (1920), p. 243 sqq., 365 sqq.—E. Janssens, *"Les premiers historiens de la vie de saint Thomas d'Aquin,"* in *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie,* 26 (1924), pp. 201 sqq., 325 sqq., 452 sqq.

[22] *Op. cit.,* chap. 34, p. 108.

ing to this account St. Thomas was working on the *Pars Tertia*, more precisely, on *Quaestio* 46 sqq., at Naples, where he was staying since October, 1272.

Modern authors, when dealing with the chronology of the *Summa Theologica*, have been guided by the accounts of Ptolemy of Lucca and William of Tocco. Thus, according to Ch. Jourdain,[23] St. Thomas wrote the *Pars Prima* from 1265 to 1268; the *Secunda* he finished in Paris between 1269 and 1271, and began the *Tertia* in Italy. K. Werner [24] gives no chronological data. According to Mausbach,[25] St. Thomas composed the first and second part in the years 1265–1271, the third part in 1271–1273. P. Conway [26] has St. Thomas begin the *Prima* in 1265, at St. Sabina in Rome, there, after his return from Paris in 1271, finish the *Secunda Secundae* and start work on the *Tertia*. M. de Wulf [27] puts down the years 1267–1273 as the time of the composition of the *Summa*.

[23] *La philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vol. I (Paris, 1858), p. 122.

[24] *Der hl. Thomas von Aquin*, Vol. I (Ratisbon, 1858), pp. 801 sqq.

[25] Article *"Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Kirchenlexikon*, Vol. XI (2nd ed.), col. 1635.

[26] *Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Longmans, 1911), p. 64, no. 73.

[27] *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*, Vol. II, p. 6.

M. Baumgartner [28] thinks that the *Prima* and *Secunda* were written during 1265–1271, and the *Tertia* 1271–1273. P. Mandonnet [29] places the beginning and conclusion of the *Summa* in the years 1267–1273. According to him the *Prima* was written in 1267–1268, the *Prima Secundae* in 1269–1270, the *Secunda Secundae* in 1271–1272, the *Tertia* in 1272–1273. O. Lottin [30] has further determined the time of the composition of the *Prima Secundae* by a comparison of content with the *Quaestiones disputatae De malo.* These were written after the *Prima*, the first two *Quaestiones* in 1269, but they were also finished before the *Prima Secundae.* This part of the theological *Summa* was written by Aquinas in the year 1271. An almost contemporaneous literary production is the *Quaestio disputata De virtutibus in communi.* This was followed by the *Secunda Secundae*, while St. Thomas was still teaching in Paris.

[28] *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastischen Zeit* (10th ed., Berlin, 1915), p. 484 (in 11th ed., Berlin, 1928, p. 425).

[29] *"Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de saint Thomas,"* in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* 9 (1920), p. 151.

[30] O. Lottin, O.S.B., *"La date de la question disputée 'De malo' de saint Thomas d'Aquin,"* in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 24 (1928), pp. 373–388. On the chronology of the *Quaestiones disputatae* see P. Synave, O.P., *"Le problème chronologique des questions disputées de saint Thomas d'Aquin,"* in *Revue thomiste,* 31 (1926).

As a matter of fact, we encounter more or less the same difficulties in fixing the time and place of the composition of the theological *Summa* which the chronology of the Saint's life presents. These difficulties, which Denifle noted, have not yet been entirely solved. The time limits between the great Scholastic's various spheres of activity are as yet by no means definitively fixed.

With the aid of the oldest data furnished by Ptolemy of Lucca and William of Tocco we can now establish the following points concerning the time and place of the composition of the *Summa Theologica:* During the years 1266–1273 St. Thomas produced the three parts of his *Summa*, partly in Italy, partly in Paris, and again partly in Italy. We can assign the *Prima* wholly to his sojourn in Italy from 1266 onward, but we cannot decide with certainty whether he commenced it at St. Sabina on the Aventine in Rome or whether he wrote it entirely at the court of Clement IV in Viterbo. The composition of the *Secunda* extended beyond this Italian period of his activity to his second sojourn in Paris, which we know lasted from 1268 to 1272. The *Tertia* he wrote in Naples, where he began to teach in the autumn of 1272, but did not work on it beyond the year 1273. According to the trustworthy account of

William of Tocco, the exhausted thinker, absorbed in the contemplation of a supramundane world and probably with a presentiment of his approaching death, laid down his pen towards the end of that year. He took it up again in February, 1274, to write at considerable length to the abbot of Monte Cassino, rendering a decision in a scientific dispute among the monks there. St. Thomas did not finish the *Summa;* he stopped in *Quaestio* 90 of the *Tertia,* in the middle of the treatise on penance. In a way the work was continued and completed in the so-called *Supplementum,* which was contributed not by Peter of Alvernia nor by Henry of Gorcum, but quite certainly by Reginald of Piperno.[31] Reginald, the "*socius carissimus*" of the Saint and his successor in the chair at Naples, took over the missing sections of the doctrine on the Sacraments as well as the Eschatology from Aquinas' *Commentary on the Sentences* and invested them with the expository form of the *Summa.*

To these chronological ascertainments I wish to add a heretofore disregarded detail, which sets

[31] Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (2nd ed., Fribourg, 1910), pp. 153 sq. In Codex 19/13 of the chapter library in Toledo, Fr. Guilelmus de Sudre, O.P., who died in 1373 as Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, is mentioned as the author of the *Supplementum.*

a definite time limit, at least negatively, to the beginning of the composition of the *Secunda*. In the *Prima Secundae*, q. 49, art. 1, *ad* 3, and also in the *Secunda*, use is made of the commentary of Simplicius on the Categories of Aristotle. Now we know from manuscripts in Paris, Venice, and Toledo that the translation of this commentary from Greek into Latin by William of Moerbeke was finished in March, 1266.[32] Hence we are certain that St. Thomas commenced to write the *Secunda* only after March, 1266.

In our chronological researches on the *Summa Theologica* we have reached the end of the earthly career of the great Scholastic. It remains for us to see by way of supplement what other works the untiring energy and labors of Aquinas produced during the years when his masterpiece was being written. It stands to reason that precisely those writings are of exceptional value for the understanding and interpretation of the *Summa Theologica* which issued contemporaneously with it from the mind and pen of the thinker, when he was at the height of his amazing literary productive-

[32] M. Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristotelesübersetzungen des 13. Jahrhunderts*, p. 148. *Idem, Mittelalterliche Aristotelesübersetzungen und Aristoteleskommentare in Handschriften spanischer Bibliotheken*, in *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1928), pp. 45 sq.

ness. Between 1260 and 1270 a part of the *Quaestiones disputatae* was written in Italy, as is evident from the catalogues of Bartholomew of Capua, Nicholas Triveth, and Ptolemy of Lucca. The *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, as has been noted before, is expressly indicated in a manuscript as having been composed in Italy. In *Clm.* 3287, fol. 115^{v}, we find in a footnote the following remark in a handwriting of the end of the thirteenth, or at the latest the beginning of the fourteenth century: "*Hic incipiunt questiones fratris T. de aquino disputate in ytalia de spiritualibus creaturis.*" [33] From the mention of the *Sequana* (the river Seine) in art. 9, *ad* 1^{um}, G. v. Hertling [34] concluded that this *Quaestio disputata* was written in Paris. In his penetrating study, frequently referred to above, on the chronology of the *Quaestiones disputatae*, Mandonnet shares this view.[35] Yet, the foregoing testimony of the Munich manuscript places it beyond doubt that this

[33] P. Beltrán de Heredia found the same note also in *Cod.* 262 (Alcobaza) of the *Bibliotheca Nacional* in Lisbon; see *La Ciencia Tomista,* 20 (1928), p. 67.

[34] "*Wo und wann verfasste Thomas von Aquin die Schrift: De spiritualibus creaturis?*" in *Historisches Jahrbuch,* V (1884), pp. 143–145. Published also by J. A. Endres in the work, *G. v. Hertling, Historische Beiträge zur Philosophie* (Munich, 1914), p. 18.

[35] P. 22.

Quaestio disputata was written in Italy. In Rome St. Thomas also composed the *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia*, as is manifest from the notice in *Cod.* 211 of the Abbey library in Subiaco: "*Quaestiones fratris Thome quas disputavit Rome.*" These *Quaestiones De potentia* deal with the same questions on the doctrine of the Trinity and Creation which are discussed in the *Prima.* The *Quaestiones disputatae De spiritualibus creaturis* and *De anima* were also written in Italy. All these are special investigations, entering deeply into themes dealt with in the *Prima*, which was also produced on Italian soil. The *Quaestio disputata De natura beatitudinis*, first published by Mandonnet,[36] and several exegetical works, likewise belong to this Italian period.

The second Parisian period of Aquinas comprises a collection of the most varied, comprehensive, and difficult writings, of which we can give only a brief description. First there is the polemical work, *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*, or, according to the notice in *Clm.* 8001 fol. 29^{v}: *Tractatus fratris Thome contra magistrum Sogerum de unitate intellectus*," which,

[36] *S. Thomae Aquinatis Quaestiones disputatae*, Vol. I (Paris, 1926), see *Introduction*, pp. 20–24.

according to a trustworthy dating in *Cod.* 225 of Corpus Christi College, Oxford,[87] was written in 1270. It is not directed against Siger of Brabant's treatise, *De anima intellectiva*, which appeared later; nor is Siger's unpublished commentary on *De anima* its immediate object of attack. The *Quaestiones disputatae de malo, de virtutibus in communi, de virtutibus cardinalibus, de caritate, de correctione fraterna, de spe*, and *de unione incarnati Verbi*[88] belong also to this second Parisian period. The questions searchingly examined here were also subjects to be discussed in the *Secunda*. As we can infer from a number of dated manuscripts, the first six *Quodlibeta* were likewise written in Paris between Lent, 1269, and Easter, 1272.[89] The other five *Quodlibeta* (by uniting two *Quodlibeta* the older manuscripts count eleven in-

[87] A. O'Rahilly, *Notes on St. Thomas. I. Some Manuscripts of the Opuscula*, in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (1927), pp. 4, 82.

[88] Fr. Pelster, S.J., *La Quaestio disputata de unit Thomae "De unione Verbi incarnati"* in *Archives de Philosophie*, 3 (1925), pp. 193–225. Cfr. also P. Synave, O.P., in *Bulletin Thomiste* (1926), pp. 1–21.

[89] Cfr. P. Mandonnet, *"Chronologie sommaire de la vie et des écrits de St. Thomas d'Aquin"* in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 5 (1911), pp. 148 sqq.—*St. Thomas d'Aquin, créateur de la Dispute Quodlibétique*, *ibid.*, 15 (1926), pp. 477–506, 16 (1927), pp. 5–36; Fr. Pelster, *"Beiträge zur Chronologie der Quodlibeta des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Gregorianum*, 8 (1927), pp. 505–538.

stead of twelve) are, for sound reasons, assigned to the Italian period preceding this second sojourn in Paris. From this latter period we have also the commentaries on a series of Aristotle's writings, which St. Thomas himself did not finish: *De caelo et mundo*, *Meteorologica*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *Politica*, *Perihermeneias*, *Analytica posteriora*, *Metaphysica*. The commentary on the *Liber de causis* also belongs here. Commentaries on Sacred Scripture likewise issued from his academic teaching during his second stay in Paris. To this period Mandonnet assigns the commentaries on the book of Job and on the Gospel of St. John.[40] The latter commentary, consisting mostly of lecture notes prepared by Reginald of Piperno, then examined and approved by St. Thomas, was perhaps written in Naples at the time when Aquinas was drawing the figure of Christ for his *Tertia*. We can say nothing certain about the date of his commentary on Jeremias and the Lamentations. The commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, which St. Thomas dictated on his deathbed to the monks of Fossanuova, has not come down to us. The two commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles published under the name

[40] P. Mandonnet, *"Chronologie des écrits scripturaires de saint Thomas d'Aquin,"* in *Revue Thomiste*, 11 (1928), pp. 34, 146 sqq.

of St. Thomas are not genuine. To the Saint's all too premature evening of life belong also the unfinished *Opuscula*, dedicated to Reginald of Piperno: *Compendium theologiae* and *De substantiis separatis* (*de natura angelorum*). The other *Opuscula*, to a part of which no certain date can be assigned, I have not included in this survey, for I only wished to indicate the main lines which fix the exact place of the theological *Summa* in the series of Thomistic writings.

These chronological and literary findings likewise constitute the historical basis for discerning and appraising the *significance of the theological Summa, viewed in its content, in the ensemble of the literary productions of St. Thomas.* Our valuation of its importance may be formulated in these terms: Taken as a whole, the theological *Summa* is the most comprehensive and most compact, the most original and most systematic exposition of the whole Thomistic theology together with its philosophical groundwork and presuppositions. Achieved during the later period of the great Scholastic's life, prepared by a series of previous works large and small, accompanied by deeply delving contemporaneous writings, the theological *Summa* is decidedly the most mature work of

Aquinas, and on very many questions it says the last word.

When it is asserted that the theological *Summa*, viewed as an aggregate achievement, as a whole, may and must be regarded as the most important and most mature work of St. Thomas, this does not mean in any way to underrate the significance and proper valuation of his other works, and least of all to belittle the necessity of studying them for the scientific understanding of his thought. In many respects the other writings enter more deeply and thoroughly into particular questions; thus they are frequently more stimulating and informative for specialized research than the great masterpiece. For the latter treats the various problems in connection with the whole, as parts of an organism, and therefore cannot devote itself as fully to single questions and follow them to their last ramifications as the other works are free to do. Then, too, the didactic purpose of the theological *Summa*, its aim to serve as a manual for the "sacrae doctrinae novitii," as we shall see further on, set certain limits to the author's mode of exposition.

As an introduction, as a deep initiation into the whole speculative theology of St. Thomas, the

Summa Theologica is and remains the classical textbook for the teaching of Thomistic doctrine. For purposes of scientific research which delves into individual problems of Thomism from the historical and speculative standpoint, the other works of Aquinas also constitute an indispensable and inexhaustible source. Devoted to detailed investigations, these works exercised the strongest influence on the thought and work of St. Thomas and consequently on the composition, elaboration, and completion of that powerful synthesis which we find in the *Summa;* it stands to reason, then, that the study of these other works will shed a vivid light on the *Summa* itself and so promote a deeper understanding of its meaning. This will be readily seen if we briefly recall the main groups of the other writings of St. Thomas.

His commentaries on the works of Aristotle are the key to an exact knowledge of the Aristotelian coefficient in Thomistic doctrine.[41] The work of creating a Christian Aristotelianism, which his great teacher Albert had undertaken with such bold initiative, was continued and finished by St. Thomas in a purer and more stylistic form; not only in the domain of philosophy, but also in that

[41] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben,* pp. 266–313.

of speculative theology he allowed the method, terminology, and content of Aristotelian philosophy to play a more important and far-reaching part than any previous Scholastic had done—so much so that his contemporaries regarded this as an innovation. If we wish to know and defend the Aristotelian factor in the theological *Summa*, and therefore the latter's essential philosophical groundwork, we must follow Aquinas to his philosophical laboratory, as it were, to his commentaries on Aristotle, and observe how he there fashions his instruments of speculation. Above all, his *Commentary on the Metaphysics* of Aristotle radiates a brilliant light on the whole theological *Summa*. At the close of the Middle Ages Dominic of Flanders, O.P., wrote an extensive work to bring out the full significance of that *Commentary* from the theological viewpoint. We are grateful to the Dominican, P. Cathala, of the *Institut Catholique* in Toulouse, for having brought out a good student's edition of the commentary.[42]

St. Thomas's *Commentary on the Sentences* was highly valued and much read both by his contemporaries and in later times, as is shown by the very

[42] *S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici, O. Pr. in Metaphysicam Aristotelis Commentaria. Cura et studio P. Fr. M. R. Cathala, O. Pr. Cum tabula analytica P. Fr. Chrys. Egan, O. Pr.* (Turin, 1916).

numerous manuscripts of the work. The theological *Summa* has by no means rendered superfluous the study of this earlier work of Aquinas. On not a few points the *Commentary* is more detailed than the *Summa.* In its philosophical sections, too, the *Commentary on the Sentences* lays a stronger emphasis on the Augustinian element and shows a greater influence of Avicenna than do the later writings of St. Thomas. Besides, it is precisely the study of this *Commentary* that enables us in a very special manner to discern and measure the progressive maturing of his thought and work, which reached their crowning point in his theological *Summa.* As we shall see briefly below, the earliest pupils of St. Thomas wrote concordances comparing the *Commentary on the Sentences* with the theological *Summa.*

Chronologically, the *Summa contra Gentiles,* also called the philosophical *Summa,* stands between the *Commentary on the Sentences* and the theological *Summa.* Conformably to its purpose to serve as a manual for the education of the Spanish Dominican missionaries among the Moors, the *Summa contra Gentiles* in its first three books deals with those philosophical and religious questions which are common to Christianity and Islam, while the fourth book takes the specifically Chris-

tian mysteries for the subject of its researches.[43] For the relation of St. Thomas to Arabian philosophy, as yet inadequately investigated, the *Summa contra Gentiles* constitutes the prime source. The apologetic *Pugio fidei,* which Raymond Martin wrote soon after, depends on it. It treats of the philosophical groundwork of theology more in detail; the harmonious relations between the natural and the supernatural, reason and faith, are more thoroughly discussed than was feasible under the plan of the theological *Summa.* What lends to the *Summa contra Gentiles* a charm quite its own, together with the impression of an overpowering unity and compactness of thought, is the systematic connection of ideas, the deduction and development of the processes of thought and proof from great truths, principles, and fundamental ideas of the metaphysical order, to which everything is referred and which, like architectonic laws, dominate and support the entire edifice. Thanks to the devoted research work of the editors, the Dominicans Makay, Constantius, and Clement Suermondt, the splendid new edition of the *Summa*

[43] M. Bouyges, S. J., *"Le plan du Contra Gentiles,"* in *Archives de Philosophie* 3 (1925), pp. 176–197. Cfr. also, N. Balthasar et A. Simonet, *Le plan de la "Somme contre les Gentils" de saint Thomas d'Aquin,* in *Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie,* 26 (1930), pp. 183–210 (Tr.)

contra Gentiles reveals to us the full significance of this Thomistic work.[44] By way of introduction the *Prolegomena* point out the great importance of the *Summa contra Gentiles* for a thorough knowledge of Thomistic doctrine. The exceedingly painstaking publication of the autograph, illustrated with facsimiles, enables us to see all the cancellations, corrections, and marginal notes of the original, and so to observe the Thomistic thought and text in the process of formation. We thus obtain a valuable insight into the genesis of Thomistic teaching—an insight which is instructive also for the explanation and appraisal of parallel points of doctrine in the *Summa Theologica.* The commentary of Francis Sylvestris of Ferrara, O.P., which accompanies this edition of the *Summa contra Gentiles,* makes us realize still more the importance of this work for the interpretation of the *Summa Theologica.*

The *Opuscula,* too, on which I could not dwell in the foregoing chronological survey, are in more than one respect very helpful for the explanation of the theological *Summa.* For, as a matter of fact, they are largely monographic treatises on problems that are dealt with in the principal work. On

[44] The English translation of this edition of the *Summa contra Gentiles* by the English Dominicans is nearing completion. (Tr.)

the discussion of the nature of theological science in the introductory question of the theological *Summa* there is no better commentary than the *Opusculum in Boethium de Trinitate*, which contains the most profound exposition of the Scholastic doctrine on science and method when Scholasticism was at its zenith. The angelology of the *Prima* is supplemented by the historically and critically more copious expositions of the opuscule *De substantiis separatis*, which, moreover, was written later than the *Prima*, as is evident from the use made of William of Moerbeke's translation (in 1268) of the Στοιχείωσις Θεολογική of Proclus. In like manner, the psychology of the *Prima* has a welcome complement in the *Opusculum De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*, also a later production, and rich in historico-critical discussions. The Christology of the *Tertia* receives light and illustration from the parallel chapter in the *Compendium Theologiae* and in the work *De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos, Graecos et Armenos*. The ideas of the *Summa* on political and social philosophy are supplemented by parallel passages in the treatise *De regimine principum*.[45] These are but a few instances of the rich profit to be derived

[45] The genuineness of this treatise is denied on unconvincing grounds by E. Flori, *Il trattato "De regimine principum" e le dottrine politiche di S. Tommaso* (Bologna, 1928).

for the understanding of the *Summa Theologica* from a thorough assimilation of the Thomistic *Opuscula.*

This understanding is likewise furthered by the commentaries on Sacred Scripture, whose rich and profound theological content is not always adequately recognized. They initiate us into the positive, biblical groundwork of the theological processes of thought and demonstration. For the structure and content of the theological reasons or proofs based on fitness, especially in the *Tertia* —in the doctrine on the Incarnation and the Sacraments—much notable material is to be found in the exegetical works of St. Thomas.

The *Quaestiones disputatae* stand in a particularly intimate relation to the *Summa Theologica;* as a result, they can render valuable services to its interpretation. The subjects of discussion are identical with those of the *Summa.* The *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate,* which preceded the theological *Summa* by almost ten years, deal with questions that recur in all three parts of the latter. The other *Quaestiones disputatae,* as we have seen, were for the most part written contemporaneously with the *Prima* and *Secunda* and resemble them in content. The outstanding characteristics of the *Quaestiones disputatae* are their fulness of detail

and their depth. Inasmuch as the material propounded in the arguments and counter-arguments (*Sed contra*) grew directly out of disputations, it has a much richer content than was compatible with the purpose of the *Summa.* And because the arguments or objections issued from the circle of university professors and students, the *Quaestiones disputatae* show, more clearly than any other writing, the coalescence of Thomistic doctrine with the theological science of the age. Herein lies a traditional and historical element. As a rule, the *corpus articuli* is quite detailed and penetrating. The historico-critical reviews of traditional opinions and attempted solutions are more searchingly made; the presuppositions of a positive and philosophico-speculative nature, on which St. Thomas bases his own solutions of the problem, can be amply stated and developed. The proof itself for these solutions can be worked out and elucidated at all points. The formulation of the "*determinatio magistralis*"—the literary redaction of which is precisely the *quaestio disputata* —under the critical gaze of the whole faculty, called for an exceptionally precise elaboration of ideas and distinctions. It stands to reason that all these factors in the *Quaestiones disputatae* supply us with abundant light for a deeper understanding

of the corresponding questions and articles in the theological *Summa.*

The importance of the *Quaestiones disputatae* from this angle has been frequently and deservedly emphasized by experts on the subject. Scheeben writes:[46] "The so-called *Quaestiones disputatae* are a rich collection of searching monographs on the most momentous topics from the whole domain of theology; here St. Thomas develops the individual problems more freely and thoroughly than in his other works. For this reason they constitute the key to the understanding of all his writings, since they are the best initiation into his manner of viewing, expressing, and treating things." P. M. Th. Coconnier, O.P., expresses the relation of the *Quaestiones disputatae* to the *Summa theologica* as follows:[47] "The *Quaestiones disputatae* are the true commentary on the *Summa.* If the latter be the book for the pupil, the former is the book for the teacher." P. Mandonnet[48] lays special stress on the manner in which the *Quaestiones disputatae* develop the subject-matter in all its bearings, "whether in the exposition of doctrine, or on points of erudition,

[46] *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik,* Vol. I (Freiburg, 1874), p. 433.

[47] *"Le vrai Thomiste,"* in *Revue Thomiste,* 1 (1893), p. 11.

[48] *Chronologie des questions disputés de Saint Thomas.*

or on the historical kinship of ideas and theories." Moreover, Mandonnet [49] regards the *Quaestiones disputatae* as a "work of collaboration" that arose from the co-operation of opponents, not only from the student body, but also from the professorial circle. Precisely this mode of origination prompted the *magister* to give to his *Quaestiones disputatae* a "maximum of precision and coherence." Their relation to the theological *Summa* is expressed by Mandonnet as follows: "One feels that in these *Quaestiones disputatae* St. Thomas is tracing out his views of a broad synthesis, of which the *Summa Theologica* will be the expression."

The insight into the relations of the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas to his other works is of paramount importance, as we shall see later, also for the method of interpreting St. Thomas—for the appropriate application of the canon of interpretation: "*Divus Thomas sui interpres.*"

III. HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL *SUMMA*. ITS COMMENTATORS

The remarkable, indeed, the unparalleled qualities which stamp the theological *Summa* as the outstanding and truly classical manual of theology

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 18; cfr. also p. 20.

for all times, have received ample and enthusiastic recognition in the history of theology. It is true that even during part of the sixteenth century the *Book of Sentences* of Peter the Lombard continued to be the text and manual of theological faculties and institutions. In fact, William Estius, who died in 1613, still wrote a commentary on the *Sentences*. Nevertheless, the contemporaries and earliest followers of St. Thomas were fully aware of the exceptional value of the *Summa* for theological instruction and research. When one peruses the works of his pupils, for the most part still unpublished, particularly those of the Dominicans (for example, Bernard of Trilia, Bernard of Clermont, Ptolemy of Lucca, Thomas of Sutton, William Petri de Godino, etc.), one observes the preference given to the use of the *Summa Theologica* of the *venerabilis Doctor frater Thomas de Aquino*,[50] the *Doctor egregius*, *Doctor communis*. Likewise, the early and earliest manuscripts in their notes, summaries, and references to parallel passages from other works of St. Thomas show distinct traces of the use of the theological *Summa* in the schools. It is not rare to find (e. g., in *Clm.* 15834) in such *notulae* a sketch of the content of the

[50] P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Les titres doctoraux de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, in *Revue Thomiste* 17 (1909), pp. 597 sqq.; J. J. Berthier, O.P., *Doctor Communis*, I (Rome, 1914).

corpus articuli, also called "*pes articuli.*" Here and there (e. g., *Cod. lat.* 1404 of the Vienna National Library, and *Cod. 3 Plut.* XVII *dextr.* of the *Biblioteca Malatestiana* in Cesena) manuscripts are provided with numerous marginal glosses quoting texts from other works of St. Thomas, comparing the doctrine of the theological *Summa* with that of the commentary on the *Sentences*, and also adducing quotations from the works of other Scholastics. In the *Cod. Vat. lat.* 4287 is preserved an apology of the theological *Summa* from the oldest Thomistic school. Outside this school, too, the *Summa* was highly prized. In the IV *Continuatio* of the *Chronica minor auctore Minorita Erphordiensi* we read:[51] "*Magister Thomas fecit etiam Summam theologie incomparabilem.*" Already in the oldest Thomistic school we come upon various expedients for promoting and facilitating the study of the *Summa.* Alphabetical indexes (*tabulae*) were prepared, of which that of Hervaeus de Cauda (*circa* 1350) met with special favor. These are preliminary works leading to the well-known *Tabula aurea* of the Dominican Peter of Bergamo (d. 1482), for all the works of Aquinas; even today it is an indispensable key to the use of Thomistic literature. More-

[51] M. G. SS. XXIV, 212.

purposes; here were brought together the points of doctrine in which the *Summa Theologica* seems to indicate a progress, an improvement on the author's *Commentary on the Sentences*.[52] In manuscripts (*Cod. lat.* 14550 of the Paris National Library, *Cod.* 322 of Klosterneuburg) the very titles of such concordances sometimes express an appraisal in favor of the theological *Summa:* "Articuli, in quibus frater Thomas *melius* in summa quam in scriptis [sc. sententiarum] dixit." One such concordance is printed among the *Opuscula* of St. Thomas; we may attribute it to Thomas of Sutton, O.P. Another more comprehensive aid, handed down, for example, in *Cod. lat.* 1468 of the Vienna National Library, was most probably composed by the Dominican Benedict of Assignano. *Abbreviaturae*, too, consisting of brief and concise selections of leading thoughts from the single articles of the *Summa*, have been preserved in manuscripts from the springtime of this

[52] P. Mandonnet, *Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste*, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 7 (1913), pp. 46–69, 245–262.—M. Grabmann, *Hilfsmittel des Thomasstudiums aus alter Zeit (Abbreviationes, Concordantiae, Tabulae)* (Freiburg, 1923). *Id., De Summae D. Thomae Aquinatis theologicae studio in Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum iam saec. XIII et XIV vigente*, in *Miscellanea Dominicana* (Rome, 1920), pp. 130–161.

enthusiasm for St. Thomas. As early as 1288 the Dominican Galienus Ozto wrote an *abbreviatio* of the *Secunda Secundae;* it is found in *Cod.* 851 of the *Bibliothèque Mazarin,* and in *Cod.* 492 of the *Bibliothèque publique* of Rheims. By order of Pope John XXII, on the occasion of the canonization of Aquinas, the Dominican John Dominici (senior) composed a voluminous abbreviation, which in many respects is also an explanation, of the theological *Summa;* it fills four folio volumes of the *Biblioteca Borghese* (*Cod.* 116–119), now in the Vatican Library.

In the fourteenth century the theological *Summa* was translated into Greek. In one of his letters the translator, the Byzantine theologian Demetrios Kydones, enlarged lucidly on the method of this Thomistic work.[53] There was also an early Arme-

[53] M. Rackl, *"Demetrios Kydones als Verteidiger und Übersetzer des hl. Thomas von Aquin"* (reprint from *Katholik,* Mainz, 1915). *Idem, "Die griechische Übersetzung der Summa theologiae des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Byz. Zeitschrift,* 24 (1923), pp. 48–60. The Ἐπιστολὴ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνου περὶ τῆς μελέτης τῶν Θεολογικῶν τοῦ ἁγίου Θωμᾶ τοῦ ἐξ Ἀκουίνου is published by Nicola Franco, *I codici Vaticani della versione greca delle opere di S. Tommaso d'Aquino,* in the jubilee work, *Nel giubileo episcopale di Leone* XIII, *omaggio della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Rome, 1893). In the fifteenth century Georgios Scholarios prepared an extract from the *Prima Secundae,* preserved in *Cod. Vat.* gr. 433. Cfr. M. Rackl, *"Eine griechische Abbreviatio der Prima Secundae des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Divus Thomas,* 9 (1922), pp. 50–59. Giovanni Mercati, *"Appunti Scolariani,"* in *Bessarione,* 24 (1920), pp. 109–143.

library in Stuttgart [54] we have a fourteenth century high-German translation of large portions of the theological *Summa*. A work of imperishable value is the fifteenth century *Defensiones theologiae D. Thomae Aquinatis*, by the *Princeps Thomistarum*, John Capreolus, O.P. (d. 1444), an explanation and defense of the whole edifice of Thomistic doctrine, particularly of the theological *Summa*. In Germany, Henry of Gorcum, an enthusiastic Thomist at the University of Cologne, wrote the *Quaestiones in partes S. Thomae*, published in Esslingen in 1473, and constituting a valuable introduction to the *Summa Theologica*. Dionysius Cartusianus (d. 1471) arranged the theological *Summa* into a veritable *Manuale Thomistarum* in his work, *Summa fidei orthodoxae*. In 1485 were published (by H. Quentell, Cologne) the *Conclusiones formales super prima parte, super prima secundae et tertia parte*, by Fr. Clement de Terra Salsa. In 1516 the Leipsic professor Jerome Dungersheim von Ochsenfurt (d. 1540) published *Conclusiones cum orationibus ad partes summe theologice*. It was a time of in-

[54] M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, pp. 432–439.

creasing preparation for the real commentaries on the *Summa Theologica*. For the rest, as early as the second half of the fifteenth century Dominican theologians in German monasteries and universities had made the *Summa Theologica* the basis of theological instruction. About 1490 the Dominican Caspar Grunwald expounded the *Summa* at the University of Freiburg in Breisgau. The same was done at the University of Rostock by the Dominicans Cornelius Sneek and John Stoppe, and at the University of Leipsic by Conrad Wimpina. Earlier, the Dominican Gerard of Elten (d. circa 1484) had given lectures on the *Prima* at the University of Cologne, which are preserved in *Cod.* A X 67 of the University library in Basle. The library of the Dominican monastery in Vienna contains manuscripts of lectures on the *Summa Theologica* which were given at the University of Cologne by the Dominican Lawrence Gervasi and the secular priest John Tinctoris. In Vienna itself such lectures were given by the Dominican Leonard of Brixental (d. *circa* 1473). The Dominicans Peter Piscatoris and Vincent Theodorici began to expound the theological *Summa* at the University of Louvain. In *Cod.* 2228 of the University library at Cracow are preserved lectures on the *Secunda*

Secundae given at that University in 1503 by Stanislaus Biel.[55]

The real era of the great commentaries on the *Summa Theologica* [56] opens with the sixteenth century, when, instead of the *Sentences*, the theological *Summa* became the approved text-book of theological instruction in the universities. In the beginning of this century commentaries on the *Summa* were written simultaneously by three Dominicans: by Thomas de Vio Cajetanus (d. 1534) in Italy, by Conrad Köllin (d. 1536) in Germany, and by Peter Crockart (d. 1514) in Paris. An illustrious pupil of the last-mentioned professor, the Dominican Francis of Vitoria, probably the most influential organizer of the Thomis-

[55] Cfr. Fr. Ehrle, *"Die päpstliche Enzyklika vom 4. August 1879 und die Restauration der christlichen Philosophie,"* in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* 18 (1880), p. 389, n. 3; N. Paulus, *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfe gegen Luther* (Freiburg, 1903), p. 70, n. 115; A. Walz, O.P., *De Magistri Gerardi de Elten O.P. lectura super I. partem Summae S. Thomae* (Rome, 1924); P. G. Löhr, O.P., *Die theologischen Disputationen und Promotionen an der Universität Köln im ausgehenden 15. Jahrhundert nach den Angaben des P. Servatius Fanckel,* O.P. (Leipsic, 1926), pp. 20. sq.

[56] Older catalogues of commentaries on the theological *Summa* are: L. Carboni, *Catalogus interpretum Summae D. Thomae Aquinatis* (Cologne, 1618), and A. Schottus, S.J., *Catalogus scholasticorum theologorum seu interpretum Summae Divi Thomae Aquinatis* (Cologne, 1618).—A. Michelitsch, *Kommentatoren zur Summa Theologiae des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Graz and Vienna, 1924).

tic school, was the first to adopt the *Summa Theologica* as the text-book and basis of his lectures at the University of Salamanca in Spain, thus giving the impetus to the general imitation of this practice, which has proved so fruitful for the progress of theological speculation.[57]

The renaissance of Scholastic theology in Spain, together with which the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas entered the universities as the text-book of systematic theology, resulted from the alliance between Humanism and Scholasticism. On the whole, Humanism in Spain assumed a friendly attitude. Nor did Scholasticism meet it in the form of Nominalism, which never quite succeeded in taking root in the Iberian peninsula. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, theology in Spain had taken a positive direction, drawing its inspiration from Sacred Scripture and the Church Fathers—I need only mention Juan de Torquemada—whereas elsewhere theology, influenced especially

[57] Cfr. Cardinal Ehrle, *"Die vatikanischen Handschriften der Salmantizenser Theologen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neueren Scholastik,"* in *Katholik,* 1884, II, pp. 495–522, 632–654; 1885, I, pp. 85–107, 161–183, 405–424, 503–522; A. Getino, *"F. Francisco de Vitoria,"* in *La Ciencia Tomista,* 1910–1912 (also published separately); *Idem, Historia de un convento* (Vergara, 1904); V. Beltrán de Heredia, O.P., *Los Manuscritos del Maestro Fray Francisco de Vitoria* (Valencia, 1928); Perez Goyena, S.J., *"Enseñanza de S. Tomás en las Universidades españolas,"* in *Razón y Fe* (1923), p. 124.

by Nominalism, neglected the positive sources and became abstract speculation and applied philosophy. In the Spanish theology and mystical doctrine of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the great Catholic intellectual movement of the medieval period—particularly that of the golden age of Scholasticism—continued to live and develop. The alliance with Humanism lent a pleasing, engaging Latinity to the great theological and philosophical works of this Spanish Renaissance, from which also issued a re-birth of Catholic scholarship in other countries. A distinct excellence of the commentaries on the theological *Summa* which came from the school of Francis of Vitoria is the union of deep speculation with a rich positive knowledge, particularly of patristic theology. Melchior Cano, O.P., who wrote commentaries (still unpublished) on parts of the *Summa Theologica*, was the creator of positive theology through his *Loci Theologici*, and has set down this statement: "Viri omnes docti consentiunt rudes omnino theologos illos esse, in quorum lucubrationibus historia muta est." (*De Locis Theologicis*, lib. 11, c. 2). From the school of Francis of Vitoria, himself the author of a commentary on the *Secunda Secundae*, unfortunately unpublished, came above all the great commentaries of Dominic Bañez, O.P. (d. 1604), Bar-

tholomew Medina, O.P. (d. 1581), and Cardinal Francis Toletus, S. J. (d. 1596). Those of Bañez (on the *Prima* and *Secunda Secundae*) and of Bartholomew Medina (on the *Prima Secundae* and the *Tertia*) complement each other and constitute a great and complete commentary of the Dominican school.

This is neither the time nor the place to mention the valuable and very numerous commentaries on the theological *Summa* written by Dominicans. This Order, with its boundless devotion to St. Thomas, can undoubtedly avail itself of a valuable tradition in the interpretation of Thomism, from the viewpoint of method as well as of doctrine; likewise, in its legislation—from the later period we may mention the General of the Order, Antony Cloche (d. 1720)—it has given very special attention to the methodical study of the *Summa Theologica*. From among the commentators who were members of the Dominican Order we may mention the following as the most noteworthy: John of St. Thomas (d. 1644), one of the very best guides through the realm of Thomistic thought; J. P. Nazarius (d. 1645); Dominic de Marinis (d. 1677); Vincent Ferre (d. 1682); C. R. Billuart (d. 1757). Three of the Dominican commentators fixed their attention

especially on the formal mode of interpretation, aiming to elucidate the logical linkage of the thought and text of St. Thomas; they are, Seraphin Capponi a Porrecta (d. 1614),[58] Jerome Medices a Camerino (d. 1622), and Dionysius Leone a Lycio (d. 1670).

The trend of the Dominican commentaries is followed by the *Cursus theologicus Salmanticensis* of the Discalced Carmelites, which Scheeben [59] declares to be "the most imposing and finished work of the Thomist school." The commentaries of Philip of the Most Holy Trinity (d. 1671), a Discalced Carmelite, and of Francis Sylvius (d. 1641), also belong to the strictly Thomist school; the same is true of Jerome Perez (*circa* 1548) and Fr. Zumel (d. 1607), both members of the Order of S. Maria de Mercede. Followers of the Dominican school are also the Benedictine theologians of the University of Salzburg, one of whom, Augustine Reding, abbot of Einsiedeln (d. 1692), wrote a commentary on the theological *Summa*, another, Paul Mezger of Eichstätt (d. 1702), composed a *Theologia scholastica secundum viam et doc-*

[58] A new edition, adapted to the times, of Capponi's *Elucidationes formales* to the *Summa Theologica* had been undertaken in Rome by the all too prematurely deceased Fr. Reginald M. Schultes, O.P.

[59] *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik,* Vol. I (Freiburg, 1874), p. 449.

trinam S. Thomae, a work very valuable for the understanding of Thomistic doctrine.

We owe an unusually large number of scholarly commentaries on the *Summa* to the theologians of the Society of Jesus, whose chief aim was an independent development of Thomistic doctrine, impregnated with exegetical and patristic erudition.[60] We have already referred to the commentary of Cardinal Toletus. The commentaries of Francis Suarez (d. 1617), the "Doctor Eximius," are conspicuous for their clearness and richness of content, and in some domains (e. g., in the treatise

[60] On the attitude of the Society of Jesus towards the study of St. Thomas, see Fr. Ehrle, S.J., *Die päpstliche Enzyklika vom 4. August 1879*, pp. 398–404; K. Six, S.J., *Franz Suarez als Förderer der kirchlichen Wissenschaft* (*P. Franz Suarez, S.J., Gedenkblätter zu seinem dreihundertjährigen Todestag* [Innsbruck, 1912], pp. 1–27); A. Inaucn, S.J., *"Stellung der Gesellschaft Jesu zur Lehre des Aristoteles und des hl. Thomas vor 1583,"* in *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, 40 (1916), pp. 201–237; *Epistola A. R. P. Wladimiri Ledóchowski, Praepositi Generalis Societatis Jesu de doctrina S. Thomae magis magisque in Societate fovenda* (reprinted *ibid.* XLII, 1918, pp. 205–253); Fr. Ehrle, S.J., *Grundsätzliches zur Charakteristik der neueren und neuesten Scholastik* (Freiburg, 1918); Reginald Schultes, O.P., *De doctrina S. Thomae magis magisque fovenda*, in *Katholik*, 1918, II, pp. 1–26; Beltrán de Heredia, O.P., *"La enseñanza de Santo Tomás en la Compañia de Jesús durante el primer siglo de su existencia,"* in *Ciencia Tomista* 6 (1915), tom. XII, pp. 388–408, tom. XIII, pp. 34–48; J. Lebreton, S.J., *"Pour suivre de plus près saint Thomas,"* in *Études*, 153 (1917), pp. 74–89; H. Dieckmann, S.J., *De Ecclesia*, Vol. II (Freiburg, 1925), p. 196 sqq.; J. Rivière, *"L'autorité de saint Thomas dans les écoles catholiques,"* in *Revue du Clergé français*, 96, (1918), pp. 37–68, 401–418.

De Legibus) they evince great progress in scientific knowledge, owing to the emergence of new problems. Other outstanding commentators on the theological *Summa* who were members of the Society of Jesus are: Gabriel Vasquez (d. 1604); Gregory of Valencia (d. 1603); Ruiz de Montoya (d. 1623), who, according to Scheeben,[61] "outstripped even Suarez in learning and depth;" James Granado (d. 1632); Adam Tanner (d. 1632); Caspar Hurtado (d. 1646); Silvester Maurus (d. 1687), and others.

At the Paris Sorbonne, commentaries on the theological *Summa* were written by Andrew Duval (d. 1637), Philip Gamachaeus (d. 1625), and Nicholas Ysambert (d. 1649). At the University of Louvain, where the *Summa Theologica* was introduced as a text-book [62] in 1596 at the instance of King Philip II of Spain, we find the commentaries of John Malderus (1633) and John Wiggers (d. 1639).

It is evident, then, that commentaries on the *Summa Theologica* were in the ascendent during the post-Tridentine period, when Catholic Scholas-

[61] *Loco citato.*

[62] R. Martin, O.P., *"L'introduction officielle de la Somme théologique dans l'ancienne Université de Louvain,"* in *Revue Thomiste,* 18 (1910), pp. 230–239.

tic theology was in flower. Ehrle rightly says:[63] "The fate of the theological *Summa* is the fate of Catholic learning; the degree of recognition this work receives in Catholic schools indicates the degree of their theological and philosophical scholarship." The Council of Trent gave expression to its conviction of the fundamental importance of the theological *Summa* by allowing this masterpiece of Aquinas a place of honor on the altar of the hall of sessions, by the side of the Sacred Scriptures and the decrees of the Popes.

It is but a continuation of time-honored tradition when the restoration of the philosophical and theological doctrine of St. Thomas under Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI, reestablishes the *Summa Theologica* in its full authority in speculative theology, and when Pope Pius X prescribes the *Summa* as the text-book for higher theological studies. It is a gratifying fact that, together with this revival of Thomistic studies, the literature of commentaries on the *Summa* also appeared anew. In the Latin language we have recent expositions of the whole or parts of the *Summa* by Cardinals Satolli, Billot, S.J.,

[63] *Die päpstliche Enzyklika vom 4. August 1879* etc. (cited above, note 55) p. 298.

and Lepicier, O.Serv.B.M.V., by L. Janssens, O.S.B., L. A. Paquet, R. Tabarelli, Pignataro, S.J., H. Buonpensiere, O.P., Norbert del Prado, O.P., and others.[64] At present the most important commentary on the *Summa* is the Dominican Th. Pègues' *Commentaire français littéral de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Toulouse, 1906 sqq.). Twelve volumes of this monumental work have already appeared; it is planned to com-

[64] Fr. Satolli, *In Summam Theol. D. Thomae Aquinatis Praelectiones*, Vol. I–V (Rome, 1884 sqq.); L. Billot, S.J., *Commentarius in Primam et Tertiam S. Thomae*, Vol. I–V (Rome, 1893 sqq.; a new edition has appeared recently); L. Janssens, O.S.B., *Summa Theologica ad modum Commentarii in Summam Theologicam S. Thomae*, Vol. I–IX (Freiburg, 1899 sqq.); L. A. Paquet, *Disputationes theologicae seu Commentaria in Summam Theol. D. Thomae*, Vol. I–VI (2nd ed., Rome, 1905–1910); Alex. M. Lepicier, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae ad textum S. Thomae concinnatae*, Vol. I–VI (Paris, 1902 sqq.); R. Tabarelli, *De Deo uno (Summa Theol.* I^{a}, q. 2–14 Rome, 1904); *De gratia Christi* (*S. Th.* I^{a}, II^{ae}, q. 109–114,—Rome, 1908); Pignataro, S.J., *De Deo creatore* (Rome, 1905); H. Buonpensiere, O.P., *Commentarius in Primam Partem Summae Theologicae S. Thomae Aquinatis* (Rome 1902); N. del Prado, O.P., *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, 3 Vols. (Fribourg, 1907. The first volume is a detailed commentary on *S. Th.* I^{a} II^{ae}, q. 109–114). Cfr. also P. Basilius a S. Anna, *Summa Summae S. Thomae in eius parte speculativa*, Vol. I–II (Verona, 1914); J. Lottini, O.P., *D. Thomae Aquinatis Summa Theologica in breviorem formam redacta, usui Seminariorum aptata* (Turin, 1925 sqq.); E. Carretti, *Lezioni di Sacra Teologia, tratte dalla Somma Teologica di S. Tommaso* (Bologna, 1923 sqq.)—We may call attention here to the English translation of the *Summa: The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, Literally Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province* (London and New York, 1911 sq.). (Tr.)

prise about twenty volumes. P. Pègues has also presented the substance of the theological *Summa* for wider circles in the form of a catechism: *La Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin en forme de Catéchisme pour tous les fidèles* (Toulouse, 1918).[65] A posthumous work of the French Thomist Schwalm, O.P. (*Le Christ d'après S. Thomas d'Aquin;* Toulouse, 1910), is an exposition of the Christological part of the *Tertia;* it is a gem as a searching interpretation of the *Summa.* An Italian commentary on the doctrine on God was written by the Thomist Luigi Galea,[66] well-known by his literary and historical researches on the *Opuscula* of St. Thomas; in this commentary he successfully elucidates the text of the *Summa* by parallel passages from other works of St. Thomas.

[65] It has been "adapted from the French and done into English" by Fr. Aelred Whitacre, O.P.: *Catechism of the "Summa Theologica" of Saint Thomas Aquinas for the Use of the Faithful* (New York and Chicago, 1922). (Tr.)

[66] *Dichiarazione delle prime ventisei questioni della Somma Teologica di S. Tommaso d'Aquino estratta parola per parola dalle opere dello stesso Angelico Dottore* (Malta, 1879).

Chapter II

SPIRIT AND FORM OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA* OF ST. THOMAS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF MEDIEVAL SCHOLASTICISM

(*A Historical Commentary on the "Prologus"*)

I. THE *PROLOGUS* IN GENERAL

The natural place for an author to indicate the aim and method of his work is the introduction, foreword, preface, or prologue. In Scholastic literature the *prologus* very often enlightens us on the occasion, import, and purpose of a book, and points out the furthering and hindering factors which influenced the realization of the scientific plan. In early Scholasticism, when the personal coloring of Scholastic literature seems more vivid and pronounced than in the thirteenth century, these *prologi* frequently furnished surprisingly deep insights into the author's methodical designs and the scientific currents of the time. Thus the scientific programme of Anselm of Canterbury

stands out in the pithy phrases of the prologue to the *Proslogium* and in the preface to the work *De fide Trinitatis et Incarnatione Verbi.* In a foreword Hugh of St. Victor gives us a brief and clear orientation on his principal systematic work, *De sacramentis fidei christianae.* In the prologue to his work, *Sic et non,* Peter Abélard initiates us into the peculiarities of his method, which consists in the confrontation of patristic texts. Peter the Lombard also places an orienting introduction at the head of his *Sentences.* The most extensive prologue, and at the same time the most instructive as a reflection of the intellectual life and aspirations of the times, is the one we meet with on the threshold of the work on the *Sentences* by Robert of Melun in *Cod.* 191 at Bruges.[1] The preface to the unpublished commentary on the *Sentences* by Peter of Poitiers is likewise rich in information on the history of the Scholastic method.[2] Of those who were working on *Summae* in Paris about the year 1200, Martin of Cremona in a somewhat turgid prologue gave a brief exposition of the methodical principles by which he was guided in the composition of his work.

The commentators on the *Sentences* who had

[1] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* Vol. II (Freiburg, 1911), pp. 340–358.

[2] *Ibid.,* pp. 504 sq.

such a luxuriant flowering in the thirteenth century, used the prologue of Peter the Lombard to develop an introductory treatise on theology; this was preceded by a prologue of their own in which, by applying a select biblical text, they gave a spirited and in parts brilliant elucidation of the sublimity and significance of the subject and content of their commentaries. In these prologues the personal note as well as references to the scientific tendencies of the times are lacking. Yet, some of these brilliant pieces of theological rhetoric furnish insights of a methodical import similar to that given, for example, by the prologue to the unpublished commentary on the *Sentences* of the Dominican Richard Fishacre, where he deals powerful side-blows to the philosophical propensities of theologians, which he deemed excessive. Later on these prologues, ingeniously constructed on a biblical motto, for the most part disappear, and the commentaries on the *Sentences* commence as a rule with the sober inquiry: "*Utrum theologia sit scientia.*"

The theological *Summae* of the thirteenth century usually begin by treating of preliminary and fundamental questions of theology more or less in detail; this introductory treatise is frequently preceded by a prologue which, in a more personal

fashion, presents a brief characterization of the projected *Summa*. In the pre-Thomistic period this prologue at the head of a *Summa* is mostly very short; indeed, as in the case of Philip of Grève, it is indicated only by an introductory sentence. Extreme brevity also marks the prologue to the *Summa universae theologiae* of Alexander of Hales. The prologue to the theological *Summa* of Albert the Great, which appeared after that of St. Thomas, is entirely in the manner of the prologues to commentaries on the *Sentences*. In a rather detailed and quite impressive prologue Ulric of Strasburg enlightens us on the motives and principles that guided him in the composition of his *Summa*. The *Summa* of Nicholas of Strasburg is likewise supplied with a foreword having a somewhat personal touch, and expressing the author's adherence to St. Thomas Aquinas and Albert the Great. Finally, we may call attention to the brisk and detailed *Prooemium*, beginning with a dedication, to a somewhat later work, the *Speculum divinorum et naturalium*, by Henry Bate of Malines.

These few strokes suffice to sketch the literary milieu out of which comes the *Prologus* to the *Summa* of St. Thomas: in manner so plain and simple, yet so instructive and rich in content when

viewed in the light of historical interpretation, it sets forth the nature and method of the whole work. Here we wish to mention still another prologue to a post-Thomistic theological *Summa*, which faithfully follows the methodical train of thought found in the *Prologus* of St. Thomas, and even betrays a verbal attuning to it. It is the prologue to the unfinished *Summa Theologica* of the General of the Carmelite Order, Gerard of Bologna (d. 1317); it is found in *Cod.* 27 of the *Biblioteca Borghese*, now incorporated in the Vatican Library. This *Summa* also follows the order of the *Quaestiones* in the *Prima* of St. Thomas. Gerard's *Prologus* begins as follows: "Pertransibunt plurimi et multiplex erit scientia. (Daniel 12, 4.) Licet haec verba Danielis de multiformi multiplicitate scientiae accipi possint, ad praesens sumuntur pro illa multiplicitate scientiae qua scientiarum scientia sacra scilicet theologia tum propter multiplicitatem quaestionum maxime inutilium et argumentorum ac etiam articulorum tum propter multiplicitatem diversarum opinionum multiplex dicitur. Attendens enim tam ex multiplicitate praefata quam ex frequenti repetitione eorumdem dictorum inducente plerisque fastidium non solum incipientes sed etiam utcumque provectos in scientia praelibata plurime impediri; propositum huius negotii

est, resecata pro posse multiplicitate inutili ea quae spectant ad sacram theologiam innitentes praecipue auxilio Christi qui habet clavem huius scientiae, ut dicitur Apoc., clare et aperte tractare prout subjectae materiae congruet."

As a rule, the *Prologus* of St. Thomas to his theological *Summa* has been but briefly touched upon or even passed over by the commentators. Many eminent interpreters of the *Prima* overlook the *Prologus* entirely, e. g., Vasquez, Molina, Gregory of Valencia, Jerome Fasoli, Granado, Serra, Xantes Mariales, Philip of the Most Holy Trinity, Gamachaeus, etc. Cajetan, Ferre, Wiggers, Capponi a Porrecta, Ripa, and others supply brief explanatory notes to the *Prologus*, without considering its deeper historical and methodological significance for the understanding of the theological *Summa*. As a matter of fact, Bañez is the only one among the older commentators of prominence who devoted a searching investigation to our *Prologus* by prefacing his deeply pondered commentary on the *Prima* with a *In D. Thomae prooemium meditatio*, and calling attention to the import of this *Prologus* in the following words: "Prooemium hoc D. Thomae brevi compendio multam eruditionis suppellectilem promittit." Bañez then refers to his intention of

writing a special monograph on this subject, but it seems he did not find time to do so. Of the most recent commentators Satolli, Buonpensiere, and Pègues make explanatory comments on our *Prologus* without, of course, intending to give an exposition and appraisal of its historical bearings.

II. THE AIM OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA* OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

The *Prologus* with which St. Thomas prefaces his theological *Summa* sets forth the aim and purpose of the work, together with the ways and means whereby the great Scholastic sought to realize them. The prologue likewise takes into account the methodical faults and obstacles in the scientific life and work of that time, and through these allusions to the state of contemporary science, it invites and aids us to understand and estimate the spirit and method of the *Summa* in the light of the intellectual currents and tendencies of Scholasticism, above all of the golden age of Scholasticism.

In the preceding literary and historical investigations, when considering the origin of the *Summa Theologica* and its place in the *ensemble* of Thomistic literature, we have established the

fact that this masterpiece did not proceed directly from the two main functions of academic instruction—the *lectio* and the *quaestio*—and hence did not constitute the subject of lectures in the classroom. And yet, as we have briefly indicated, the *Summa* is written for students of theology, for the school.

This didactic aim is clearly pointed out in the first paragraph of the prologue: "Because the master of Catholic Truth ought not only to teach the proficient, but also to instruct beginners (according to the Apostle: As unto little ones in Christ, I gave you milk to drink, not meat; 1 Cor. III, 1, 2), we purpose in this book to treat of whatever belongs to the Christian religion, in such a way as may tend to the instruction of beginners." [3]

These words breathe the devoted love of St. Thomas for his pupils, which urges him to take up his pen and write a manual for the "*novitii sacrae doctrinae*." Indeed, he had a high idea of the dignity and duty of a professor of theology, on whose rôle and importance in the life of the Church he expresses himself so lucidly in *Quodl.* I, 14. With fine psychological insight he has in-

[3] *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas. Literally Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province,* Vol. I (London & New York, 1911), p. LXXXIX. (Tr.)

vestigated (in *Quaestio XI disputata de veritate: De magistro*) the laws of the influence exerted by the teacher on the unfoldment of the mental life of the pupil. Personal remarks in his *Opuscula* (e. g., *De regimine Judaeorum, De sortibus*) evince his devotion to the professorial calling in his own amiable manner. Peter Calo, O.P.,[4] one of the earliest biographers of Aquinas, portrays his activity as a professor in these enthusiastic words: "When Thomas had entered upon his duties as teacher and had begun the disputations and lectures, students flocked to his school in such numbers that the lecture-hall could hardly accommodate all who were attracted and spurred on to progress in the pursuit of learning by the teaching of such an eminent master. Under the light of his instruction many masters flourished, both of the regular and of the secular clergy. The reason of this success was the terse, clear, and readily intelligible style of his lectures." His devotion to the mission of teaching and to his pupils was not confined to the chair and the lecture-hall: it followed the Saint to his desk in his silent cell. From this attachment to his students, particularly to the newcomers and tyros who were wrestling with

[4] *Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis auctore Petro Calo.* Ed. D. Pruemmer, O.P. (Toulouse, 1911), p. 30.

manifold difficulties, sprang his resolve to write the *Summa Theologica*. When one peruses the works, for the most part unpublished, of the immediate and remote pupils of St. Thomas in and outside his Order—the works of Thomists like Remigius Girolami, the teacher of Dante, Ptolemy of Lucca, Bernard of Clermont, Bernard of Trilia, Rambertus dei Primadizzi, John of Sterngassen, Albert of Brescia, Thomas of Sutton, John of Naples, Peter of Alvernia, Aegidius of Rome, Herveus Natalis, and others—one can in some measure feel from their attachment and enthusiasm what St. Thomas meant to his pupils. It were enough to write the biography of Reginald of Piperno [5] in order to verify, in its noblest form, the Saint's benevolent love for one of his pupils, his "*socius carissimus*." Unfortunately we do not have sufficient data about two other pupils especially dear to him, John of Cajatia and Peter of Andria.[6] The biography of William of Tocco as well as the acts of his canonization process show us in many passages how St. Thomas devoted to

[5] We may expect a biography of Reginald of Piperno from the expert pen of P. Mandonnet. Cfr. also A. d'Achille, O.P., *Una fervida amicizia nella vita di S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, in *Memorie Domenicane* 41 (1924), pp. 97–112.

[6] J. Taurisano, O.P., *Discepoli e biografi di S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, in *S. Tommaso d'Aquino. Miscellanea storico-artistica* (Rome, 1924), pp. 111–186.

his pupils not only his deep and clear intellect, but also his pure and noble heart. This mental attitude enables us to understand the words of the *Prologus*, according to which the teacher of Catholic truth should bestow his solicitude and efforts not only on advanced students, but also on beginners.

The content and subject of the work St. Thomas proposes to write for "the instruction of beginners," he tersely points out to be "whatever belongs to the Christian religion." He aims to expound the whole content of the Christian religion, taken in the widest sense, to write a *Summa Theologiae* in the fullest and truest meaning of the word. The biblical and patristic groundwork and material of theology are everywhere fully discussed; dogmatic theology is there in all its depth as a great speculative system; Christian moral teaching together with its juridical and sociological applications is treated of in a very detailed and thorough fashion; canon law, insofar as it has a bearing on theoretical systematic theology, is taken into account more extensively by St. Thomas than by other contemporary Scholastics; for Church liturgy and symbolism he evinces a rich understanding; finally, the theory of Christian mysticism is likewise embodied in this doctrinal edifice.

But it is not only the content of the Christian religion that the *Summa* aims to present on a large scale; it also devotes special attention to the philosophical, metaphysical, psychological, and ethical foundations of speculative theology, and this in a measure not equaled by any previous theological *Summa*. Indeed, the utilization of Aristotelian philosophy for the exposition, confirmation, and systematization of dogmatic and moral theology, without entailing any distortion in the content of the traditional teaching of the Church, is the characteristic of the lifework of St. Thomas, particularly in the monumental form it has taken in the *Summa*. In this work he deals with philosophical subjects from the standpoint of the theologian. In this sense he writes at the beginning of his detailed treatise on psychology in the *Prima* (q. 75–89): "Naturam autem hominis considerare pertinet ad theologum ex parte *animae*." Accordingly, the philosophical discussions, so copiously inserted in the *Summa*, also come under "those things which pertain to the Christian religion."

This whole content of the Christian religion in the widest sense, St. Thomas wishes to elaborate in a large systematic work in a manner that will take into account the conditions and needs of beginners in the study of theology ("in such a way as may

tend to the instruction of beginners"). The norms and methodical principles which are to guide him in this task, and which initiate us into the spirit and form of the *Summa Theologica* are outlined in the following portion of the *Prologus*. We shall subject it to a thorough analysis in the section immediately following. What has been said concerning its large didactic scope, may be summarized in the definition of the theological *Summa* given by the Louvain theologian, J. A. Wiggers:[7] "The *Summa Theologica* is a methodical exposition of the whole sacred doctrine, composed and arranged in the order, manner, and form most suitable for beginners, so that they may acquire it with greater ease and profit."

III. THE WAYS AND MEANS FOR REALIZING THE AIM OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA*

1. *Avoidance of superfluous questions, articles, and arguments.—Perfection of the Scholastic method of exposition.*

As we have seen, St. Thomas was prompted to compose his *Summa Theologica* by the didactic

[7] *In Primam Partem D. Thomae Aquinatis Commentarii* (Louvain, 1678), p. 1.

aim of providing students of theology with a text-book corresponding to their needs. This aim he seeks to realize mainly by employing a method most suitable for the scientific progress of young theological students ("for the instruction of beginners"). To attain this end, he purposes to apply the proportionate didactic means.

In his Prologue he enlarges negatively on this point by specifying the didactic faults and shortcomings found in works heretofore at the disposal of theological students, and by determining to avoid them. Not only has St. Thomas avoided these faults in his *Summa*, but he has positively achieved in this work an unrivalled masterpiece of methodical and didactic skill.

Let us first give his own exposition of his programme:

"We have considered that students in this science have not seldom been hampered by what they have found written by other authors, partly on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments; partly also because those things that are needful for them to know are not taught according to the order of the subject-matter, but according as the plan of the book might require, or the occasion of the argument offer; partly, too, because frequent repetition

brought weariness and confusion to the minds of the readers."

"Endeavoring to avoid these and other like faults, we shall try, by God's help, to set forth whatever is included in this Sacred Science as briefly and clearly as the matter itself may allow." [8]

The full import of these statements will be most readily understood after one has visualized the gradual development of the Scholastic method, and acquired a more accurate knowledge of the theological curriculum and management of instruction, and of the philosophical and theological literature which appeared before the time of St. Thomas and during the period of his activity. This Prologue to the *Summa* is in fact a very valuable document for the history of the Scholastic method as well as for the scientific individuality of St. Thomas.

Let us proceed to explain the single methodical viewpoints and traits found in the foregoing words of Aquinas.

The first fault which in his own gentle way he censures as a didactic drawback in the writings of various authors, and which he means to avoid, is

[8] *The "Summa Theologica,"* etc., *loc. cit.*—This first volume of the English translation also contains a discussion of "The Method of St. Thomas," pp. LXIV sqq. (Tr.)

the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments. If we compare his *Summa Theologica* with other systematic works, particularly those of the earlier Scholastics, we must own that St. Thomas has overcome this fault in a most happy fashion by the process of simplification on a large scale, and by endowing his work to a marvelous degree with the qualities of brevity and clearness. When we survey the *ensemble* of the *Summa* on its technical side, we find the systematic arrangement itself to be simpler and more perspicuous than in other works of this kind. St. Thomas divides his work into parts, the parts into questions, the questions into articles. The division of other *Summae* is much more intricate. The *Summa aurea* of William of Auxerre, for example, is distributed into books, treatises, chapters, and questions. Alexander of Hales divides his *Summa* into *partes*, *quaestiones*, *membra*, *articuli*, and *paragraphi*.[9] Similar to this is the plan of division in the *Summa Theologica* of Albert the Great, namely, into *partes*, *quaestiones*, *membra*, and *articuli*, the latter frequently branching out into *quaesita*.

If we examine the theological *Summa* of Aquinas

[9] In the new Quaracchi edition the division is materially simplified.

as a whole and from the side of its content, we find a series of questions eliminated which earlier *Summae* as well as commentaries on the *Sentences* discussed with a display of great dialectic acumen, but which, in their intrinsic value and results, were of no avail for the true progress of theological students. To give just a few examples: when treating of divine omnipotence, earlier *Summae* and commentaries on the *Sentences* introduced a number of subtle questions. In the *Summa* of Simon of Tournai we find, for example, the query: "An Deus possit plus quam omnia." In the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas (I^a q. 25) such questions are absent. In expounding the doctrine on the Trinity earlier authors, for example Praepositinus, discussed the *notiones* and *termini notionales* in detail and with great subtlety. Alexander of Hales devotes four long *Quaestiones* to the *nomina notionalia* (*Summa Theol.*, I, q. 68–71). How simple and brief and at once rich in content are the expositions in the *Summa Theologica*, I^a, q. 32. In Christology, when dealing with the teaching on Christ as the Head of the Church, earlier theologians like Martin of Cremona and William of Auxerre (*Summa aurea*, l. 3, tr. I, c. 4, q. 3) put the question: Why Abel and not Adam is called the *principium ecclesiae*. In his *Summa Theologica*,

III[a], q. 8, St. Thomas has no questions of this sort. In earlier *Summae* the treatises on Moral Theology contain a series of casuistic questions often decidedly subtle and unreal. I refer here only to the *Summa* of Godfrey of Poitiers. In the still unpublished third part of his *Summa de creaturis: De bono sive de virtutibus*, Albert the Great has given a strictly scientific exposition of the doctrine on the virtues. In his *Secunda*, which his contemporaries recognized as his most significant achievement, St. Thomas discarded all the useless questions formerly discussed. We may also point out that in his *Summa* he eliminated a number of questions he had dealt with in his commentary on the *Sentences*.

As the survey of the *Summa* as a whole proves that its author has been successful in avoiding the "multiplication of useless questions and articles," so the study of the single articles shows that he has masterfully shunned the "multiplication of useless arguments." While in the *Summa contra Gentiles* St. Thomas avails himself of a freer form of exposition, he invests the articles of the *Summa Theologica* with the Scholastic technique then in use and founded on the presentation of contesting arguments *pro et contra*. As the title of each article he gives a precise formulation of the question, be-

ginning with "*Utrum.*" Thereupon the phrase "*Videtur quod non*" introduces a number of arguments or objections directed, as a rule, against the author's view and his solution of the question. Then, with the stereotyped introductory formula "*Sed contra,*" there usually follows only one counter-argument which almost always announces the answer St. Thomas gives to the question. What occurs more frequently in the *Quaestiones disputatae,* happens in rare cases also in the *Summa Theologica,* namely, that the *responsio principalis* is placed between the arguments *pro* and *contra.* In this case the article concludes by justifying the statement made in the "*Sed contra.*" After the arguments of the "*Videtur quod non*" and of the "*Sed contra*" have thus set forth the reasons *pro* and *con* and thereby unfolded the difficulties of the problem, the solution of the question is introduced with the phrase "*Respondeo dicendum.*" This solution is prepared, stated, and established in this most important and decisive portion of the article, called the *corpus articuli.* On the basis of this solution, and of the proofs advanced in its support, the last part of the article answers the arguments or objections brought forward in the beginning. With reason, then, St. Thomas always introduces this

concluding portion of the article with the words: "Ad primum *ergo* dicendum."

In order to discern and fully appreciate how masterfully St. Thomas managed this technique and so avoided the "multiplication of useless arguments" and brought simplicity, brevity, and clearness into the processes of his thought and demonstration, it is both useful and necessary to cast a glance backward and seek for points of comparison in history. As early as the end of the eleventh century canonists like Bernold of Constance, Ivo of Chartres, and others had proposed rules for the reconciliation of seemingly contradictory authorities. In his work *Sic et non*, Peter Abélard had brought together patristic texts apparently contradicting one another; in the introduction he gave rules for establishing the compatibility of these discordances, particularly by means of dialectics. However, this *Sic-et-non* method contributed less to the rise of the Scholastic technique of exposition than the discovery of the *logica nova*, that is, of Aristotle's *Analytica priora et posteriora, Topica, and Sophistica.*[10] It was, in fact, under the influence of these Aristotelian writings,

[10] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, Vol. II, p. 219 sqq.

particularly the *Topica*, that, in the twelfth century, the *disputatio* was gradually developed in the schools of Paris, in which the solution of a problem was prepared and brought about by the clashing of reasons *pro* and *contra*. This method of discussion was given literary permanence in the above-mentioned *Summae*, which appeared in Paris about this time. Besides their *Summae*, Simon of Tournai and Philip of Grève have also left us *Quaestiones disputatae*. The discovery of the principal writings of Aristotle, particularly his *Metaphysics*, which in the beginning of the third book expressly recommends the nice balancing of reasons *pro* and *contra* as a means for reaching the truth, contributed considerably to the further development of this Scholastic method of disputation and exposition. Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, St. Bonaventure, Peter of Tarantasia and others, deserve much credit for having greatly improved this method.

When, however, we compare from this standpoint the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas with earlier works, especially with the earlier *Summae*, we at once become convinced that by eliminating "useless arguments" he has attained great conciseness, simplicity, brevity, and lucidity. By emphatically shifting the centre of gravity in his

articles from the arguments *pro et contra* to the *corpus articuli*, to the *responsio principalis*, he has increased the compactness, soundness, depth, and clarity of his exposition to an extraordinary degree. In earlier authors the main stress is laid on the arguments *pro* and *contra*, which are often massed in great number. With Praepositinus and others the objections and answers, and still other difficulties against these answers, are so intermingled that the perspicuity of exposition suffers considerably. The solution then plays a very modest rôle and is frequently expressed in a single sentence. This preponderance of the disputatious factor in the arguments *pro* and *contra* over the thetic element of the *solutio* or, as it was later called, the *responsio principalis*, is present in large measure also in the *Summa Theologica* of Alexander of Hales. Albert the Great likewise gives the impression that he strives to reach the final solution of the problem in the diffuse *pro* and *contra* arguments, although in his *Summa de creaturis* he devotes more space to the *solutio*.

In his *Quaestiones disputatae*, where he was not guided by the same didactic aims as in the composition of the *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas often adduced numerous objections, against which, in the "*Sed contra*," he usually brought together

several, sometimes many, counter-arguments. It is also true, however, that precisely his *Quaestiones disputatae* devote the largest space to the *corpus articuli*. In the *Summa Theologica* the objections as a rule are not numerous, and usually there is only one counter-argument in the "*Sed contra*," which, with few exceptions, indicates the solution given in the immediately following body of the article.[11] If we compare the objections in the articles of the *Summa* of St. Thomas with those of earlier *Summae*, we realize that he has eliminated a host of "useless arguments," retained and solved some weighty traditional objections in his own original manner, and also added new difficulties whenever he deemed it useful in the interest of science, the elucidation of truth, and the progress of "students of the sacred science." Frequently he makes use of objections to present and appraise traditional ideas, to throw light on every aspect of a definition (e. g., *Summa Theol.*, I^a, q. 8, art. 1, and q. 29, art. 1), and in the answers to these objections to introduce incidental remarks, corollaries, and supplements which would have interfered with the perspicuity of the demonstration if in-

[11] Cfr. F. A. Blanche, O.P., "*Le vocabulaire de l'argumentation et la structure de l'article dans les ouvrages de Saint Thomas*," in *Revue des sciences philos. et théol.* 14 (1925), pp. 167–187.

serted in the principal part. Generally, the objections are organically related to the development of the body of the article. The manner in which St. Thomas proceeds in each particular case gives evidence of a fine sense for method.

As to the *corpus articuli*, which may be regarded as the entelechy of the whole article (in the marginal notes of manuscripts this *responsio principalis* is also called *pes articuli*), all its parts aim to state and solve the question briefly, precisely, and clearly; far from being modeled after a fixed plan or pattern, it shows variations corresponding to the various bearings of problems. Superfluous accessories and distracting digressions are avoided. Under the influence of his great didactic purpose, the author exercises the sternest self-control and limitation. The solution of the question, whether in one or more theses or *conclusiones*, is formulated sharply and precisely; wherever possible, it is demonstrated in a manner that is clear and convincing. In the case of theses for which a cogent proof is not to be had, St. Thomas expressly notes the purely probable character of his argumentation, or altogether foregoes an answer. In the body of the article he is chiefly concerned with conveying true and clear ideas to the mind of the reader, the student of theology. This

preoccupation is distinctly indicated by the oft-recurring phrase at the head of the *corpus articuli*: "*Ad cuius evidentiam considerandum est.*" He always strives to found the proof of his solution upon a solid basis. Hence he seeks to secure a deep groundwork for the premises of his conclusion and to lay bare all the roots and presuppositions out of which his decision grows. Here it is not so much the dialectician as the metaphysician who comes to the fore. The great metaphysical principles illumine his processes of demonstration.

The Scholastic method and technique of Aquinas should not be considered from the formal point of view only: its originality is best seen when surveyed from the heights of the metaphysics of being; here also, in the development of the premises and concatenation of ideas, St. Thomas shuns all that is superfluous. Quite frequently a critico-historical section precedes the thetic and demonstrative portion of the *corpus articuli*. After the Aristotelian pattern and conformably to the modern mode of procedure, the attempts heretofore made to solve a problem are clearly and objectively presented and critically examined, their mutual relation is often weighed and the deeper roots of erroneous theories are laid bare; but the kernel of truth found at the bottom of such re-

jected opinions is willingly recognized and frequently incorporated in the definitive solution. It is well known that the Angelic Doctor's criticism of the scientific conceptions of others is always exceptionally calm, gentle, and strictly impersonal. On this point Pope Benedict XIV made this beautiful observation:[12] "St. Thomas Aquinas, the angelic Prince of the Schools and Doctor of the Church, in his composition of so many volumes which can never be sufficiently praised, necessarily came upon various opinions of philosophers and theologians which truth urged him to refute. But what so admirably crowns the other merits of this eminent Doctor is the fact that he was never known to make light of, taunt, or traduce any of his opponents, but deserved well of all by his courtesy and exceptional kindliness; for if he found anything in their writings rather harsh, ambiguous, or obscure, he strove to interpret it mildly and favorably, to tone down and explain it. If, however, the interests of religion and faith demanded that their opinion be rejected and refuted, he discharged this duty with such moderation that he deserves as much praise for his manner of differing from them as for his defense of Catholic truth."

The whole structure of the article in the *Summa*,

[12] *Constitutio "Sollicita et provida,"* § 24.

therefore, is proof of the effort of St. Thomas to avoid "the multiplication of useless arguments," just as the *Summa* as a whole shows his keen sense of method in shunning the "multiplication of useless questions and articles" which rendered other Scholastic works, especially those of the earlier "summists," less available for the purposes of theological instruction. As a result, simplicity, brevity, clearness, and the strictest objectivity are the basic qualities of the method proper to the *Summa*. William of Tocco,[13] the biographer and pupil of St. Thomas, rightly stresses the fact that the lectures of his celebrated master were characterized by a "manner of teaching that was succinct, plain, and easy." These didactic qualities belong to the *Summa Theologica* in an eminent degree. So, too, the simple, clear, precise language, carving out the thought in sharp outlines and characterizing all the writings of St. Thomas, but particularly his theological *Summa*, forms a transparent medium for all these excellences of method.

In this connection Bartholomew Medina, O.P.,[14] makes the following pertinent remarks concerning the Saint's way of working: "The holy Doctor ex-

[13] *Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis*, c. 17; ed. Pruemmer, p. 86.

[14] *Scholastica Commentaria in D. Thomae Primam Secundae* (Cologne, 1618), *Argumentum operis.*

plains matters in proper and apt language, devoting more care to things than to words, and always keeping close to the point at issue; keenly realizing what the theologian has to prove, he omits other arguments and concentrates all the powers of his mind on that. The manner of teaching, therefore, is plain and orderly; neither vehement nor turgid, but forceful and guarded on every side. How well it infers the most hidden and profound truths about all things from the highest principles; with what acumen it refutes the arguments of others; how strongly it secures and corroborates its own! There is in it nothing unprofitable, nothing superfluous—all is solid, all full of meaning: it may truly be said of this doctrinal edifice that not even one stone, that is, one word can be removed without the collapse of the whole." Because of its majestic simplicity, the Dominican Lacordaire has likened the *Summa* of St. Thomas to the pyramids. Let us conclude these tributes with the words of an eminent Thomistic scholar of our day. Fr. Diekamp writes:[15] "The great teacher wrote this *Summa* for beginners or students of theology, and this purpose it answers perfectly. An admirable

[15] *Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des hl. Thomas,* Vol. I (2nd ed., Münster, 1917), p. 78.

lucidity is diffused over the whole; the plan is transparent throughout; the simplicity and scientific accuracy of diction are unexcelled."

2. Avoidance of intricacy and confusion in the arrangement of the subject-matter.—External and internal systematization of the "Summa Theologica."

The second fault of method which St. Thomas notes in the writings of various Scholastic authors and regards as a hindrance to "students of the sacred doctrine," is the lack of systematic arrangement and sequence. To realize the justice of this criticism, and at the same time to appreciate the eminently successful way in which St. Thomas remedied this defect, we must again have recourse to a comparative historical retrospect and survey. The *Prologus* itself is the best guide in this matter when it specifies that this drawback to the progress of theological students consists in the fact that the subjects of knowledge necessary for the beginner are not presented in a strictly methodical and systematic sequence, but rather in the order suggested by the explanation of text-books or the practice of disputations. Here we must recall the twofold function of the professor of theology to

which we have referred previously: the *lectio* and the *quaestio*.

In the front rank of texts whose interpretation does not readily lend itself to a clear and thoroughly systematic exposition of doctrine, stands the *Book of Sentences* of Peter the Lombard. It was the task of the bachelor of theology, as we saw, to explain this work in his lectures. In doing so, he naturally had to follow the order of the text. At first the commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard had rather the character of glosses, similar to those on Sacred Scripture. The earliest unpublished gloss on the *Sentences* of the Lombard comes from his pupil, Peter of Poitiers. Even the commentary on the *Sentences* by Cardinal Hugh of St. Cher, O.P. (d. 1263), is in the main an *expositio textus*. In the commentary of Richard Fishacre, O.P. (d. 1248), independent and often profound investigations are interwoven in the continuous explanation of the text. The same holds true of the commentary of Richard Rufus—the earliest commentary on the *Sentences* issuing from the Franciscan school at Oxford.[16]

Very soon, however, the *expositio textus* was combined with original *quaestiones*, proposed and

[16] Fr. Pelster, S.J., *"Der älteste Sentenzenkommentar aus der Oxforder Franziskanerschule,"* in *Scholastik*, I (1926), pp. 50–80.

solved by the commentator himself, which for the most part became more extensive than the strict interpretation of the text. The best example of this is the *Commentary on the Sentences* written by St. Thomas. At the beginning of every *distinctio* he gives a brief *divisio textus*, usually followed by several *quaestiones*, quite independent of the text of the Lombard; these are divided into *articuli* and often subdivided into *quaestiunculae;* the subjects under consideration are treated in a free and original form. The *distinctio* is concluded with a very brief *expositio textus*. Not seldom this *divisio* and *expositio textus* were omitted altogether, and the *quaestiones* alone were presented; this is the case, for example, in the commentary on the *Sentences* by Cardinal Annibaldus de Annibaldis, O.P., a friend of St. Thomas. Later on there appear short literal interpretations of the *Sentences* and *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum* as two distinct and independent forms of literature. Many Scholastics, like James of Lausanne and Durandus, have left us both kinds of explanations of the *Sentences* in separate works.

Parallel developments are to be found in commentaries on Aristotle and in Biblical exegesis. Manuscripts bear witness to the fact that even before the great Aristotelian commentaries of

Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas, there existed a gloss on the writings of Aristotle.[17] The technique of the commentaries on Aristotle was developed within the faculty of arts of the University of Paris before the Aristotelian interpretations by Albert the Great and St. Thomas appeared. In the commentary of Peter of Ireland, the teacher of St. Thomas in his youth, on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry (*Cod. Vat. lat.* 5988), a *lectio* on a passage from Aristotle is composed of the *divisio et expositio textus*, *notabilia*, and *dubia* or *quaestiones*. A similar structure of the *lectio* is to be found in the commentary on Aristotle by Nicholas of Paris. In the commentaries of William of St. Amour (contained in *Cod.* 109 Ripoll. of the *Archivo de la Corona de Aragón*) the *lectio* consists of *divisio*, *sententia*, and *quaestio*. The commentaries on Aristotle by Adam of Bocfeld are chiefly mere paraphrases of the Aristotelian text. The commentary of Peter of Spain on *De animalibus*, of Henry of Ghent on the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, of Martin of Dacia and Boëtius of Dacia on Aristotle's works on logic, the extensive commentaries on Aristotle by Siger of Brabant, apply almost exclusively the technique of the *Quaestiones*.

[17] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristotelesübersetzungen des 13. Jahrhunderts*, p. 86.

The interpretation of Aristotle by St. Thomas Aquinas and Aegidius of Rome combines the continuous textual explanation with the presentation of original questions. In his commentaries on Aristotle, Peter of Alvernia, a pupil of St. Thomas, shows preference for the expository form of the *Quaestiones disputatae*, which was almost universally in use in the faculty of arts, for example, by Henry of Brussels, Radulphus Brito, etc. Bartholomew of Bruges wrote one commentary on the *Economics* of Aristotle in the form of an *expositio*, and another in the form of *quaestiones*.[18]

On the development of the method applied in medieval Scriptural interpretation, the best and most reliable information is furnished by P. Denifle.[19] The standard method of exegesis in use until far into the thirteenth century was the gloss; we find it in its typical form in the commentaries of Peter the Lombard on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles. In the thirteenth century it was chiefly St. Thomas who introduced and inserted the *quae-*

[18] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, pp. 222–248, 281–289. Newly discovered *"Quaestionen Sigers von Brabant zu den Werken des Aristoteles' (Clm. 9559),"* in *Miscellanea Ehrle* (Rome, 1924), pp. 103–147; *Mittelalterliche lateinische Aristotelesübersetzungen und Aristoteleskommentare in Handschriften Spanischer Bibliotheken*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1928.

[19] *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Iustitia Dei (Rom. I, 17) und Iustificatio* (Mayence, 1905).

stio into exegesis, for the exposition of the deeper theological meaning of Sacred Scripture. While St. Thomas combines the continuous explanation of the literal sense with independently propounded questions, later on a division into two distinct literary forms took place: the one, a brief exposition of the literal meaning of the Bible; the other, more detailed and engaging in original questions and researches on the Biblical text. Denifle calls the first form the cursory, the second, the magisterial interpretation of Holy Writ.

This historical digression was necessary in order to make clear how St. Thomas could find in the conventional explanation of text-books (*lectio*) a difficulty and a barrier to the progress of "students of the sacred doctrine." The exposition of the *Book of Sentences* first claims our attention, and then the interpretation of Sacred Scripture. It need hardly be stressed that the critical remarks of the Prologue were by no means directed against the legitimate employment of this traditional form of the *lectio* in theological instruction. As Ptolemy of Lucca informs us, Aquinas himself undertook to write a second commentary on the *Sentences* of the Lombard and actually finished the first book thereof, which has unfortunately been lost. Fur-

thermore, as master of theology, he interpreted the books of the Bible in the accepted manner, and it is likely that most of his exegetical works were written only during the last period of his life, and therefore later than the Prologue to the *Summa*. In this Prologue he only wishes to point out more or less unavoidable faults and shortcomings which, from the systematic standpoint, are inherent in the exposition of text-books and can be a drawback to the scientific progress of beginners in theology. At bottom, these didactic defects result from the fact that the knowledge necessary for students of theology is not presented in the systematic order demanded by the content of that discipline and by the logical connection of ideas, but rather according to the arrangement of the textbook explained.

This is self-evident in the interpretation of Sacred Scripture. For the rest, also in his exegetical works St. Thomas has shown an exceptional talent for systematization, as witness, for example, the Prologue to his commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. As to the arrangement and structure of the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, they show considerable defects from the systematic point of view. The general treatise on God and that on the Trinity are not separated, but intermingled and

lacking in organization. The doctrine on the virtues is not elaborated as a systematic whole, and a substantial portion of it is inserted between two treatises so directly connected as those on the Incarnation and on the Sacraments. As a matter of fact, the *Sentences* of the Lombard are entirely lacking in uniform organic arrangement. Nor was the plan of division into "*res et signa*," borrowed from St. Augustine's work "*De doctrina christiana*," calculated to make a rigid systematic construction feasible. From these faults of arrangement in the text-book it is quite evident that the current commentaries on the latter could not give that transparent and readily surveyed distribution of the subject-matter which is so helpful to students.

Besides, also the earlier theological *Summae* were more or less dependent on the systematization of the Lombard's work and could not easily rid themselves of the faults in construction inherent in the doctrinal edifice of the *Magister Sententiarum*. We see this in Praepositinus and the other writers of *Summae* at the beginning of the thirteenth century in Paris. On the whole, the *Summa aurea* of William of Auxerre also follows the main arrangement of the Lombard, even though the logical sequence of ideas is more apparent in the individual

treatises. The most imposing *Summa* of Scholasticism, the *Summa universae theologiae* of Alexander of Hales, is likewise constructed on the lines of the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard—so much so that in many manuscripts it is erroneously designated as a commentary on the *Sentences*. In details the *Doctor Irrefragabilis* effected substantial improvements on the systematization of the Lombard. Thus, as Praepositinus had already attempted to do, he separated the general treatise on God from that on the Trinity; in these two treatises, which make up the first book, he followed a much better order by being guided by an objective point of view. The first part is the best elaborated, while the others frequently give the impression of lacking finish and completeness. Only when the splendid new edition of the *Summa* of Alexander of Hales has been brought out by the Franciscans of Quaracchi, shall we be able to form a clear idea of the systematization of the entire work, in which the authenticity of the larger portion, the work of Alexander himself, still remains to be determined. He made a further systematic improvement by transferring the treatise on grace to the third book, combining it with that on the virtues, unfinished it is true, and placing it imme-

diately after that on the Incarnation, whereas Peter the Lombard treats of it in the second book, together with creation. This insertion of the treatise on grace between those on the Incarnation and the Sacraments is also the usual one in modern manuals and courses of dogmatic theology. The arrangement of the individual parts frequently leaves much to be desired in the matter of clearness and distinctness. Here I can refer only to the treatise on man (*Summa Theol.*, II, q. 59–90), where one finds an abundance of psychological and anthropological material without any clear-cut arrangement and proper proportion. We need but compare this with the parallel treatise in the *Summa* of St. Thomas (I^a, q. 75–89), in order to realize the vast disparity in systematization. There are, then, real grounds for assuming that in his Prologue St. Thomas had in mind especially the *Summa universae theologiae* of Alexander of Hales. Scheeben [20] has voiced the opinion that "besides the prolix commentaries on the Lombard, St. Thomas undoubtedly had Alexander's *Summa* in mind when he declared his intention to write his more concise *Summa* for beginners, as against the more extensive works hitherto composed for ad-

[20] *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, Vol. I, p. 430.

vanced students." This opinion is shared by Parthenius Minges,[21] according to whom St. Thomas in his *Prologus* seems to allude to the *Summa* of Alexander of Hales.

Not only the Scholastic works arising from the *lectio*, from the explanation of text-books, but also the Scholastic writings which are the redaction of the disputations, are wanting in the systematic arrangement desirable for beginners. This holds true of the two literary forms of the *Quaestiones disputatae* and the *Quaestiones de quolibet* or *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, whose origin and peculiarity we have briefly indicated above. Naturally, St. Thomas by no means intends to undervalue the *Quaestiones* as such. Indeed, he himself wrote by far the greater part of his *Quaestiones disputatae* and *Quaestiones quodlibetales* after having set down these criticisms in his Prologue to the *Summa*. What he wishes to emphasize is the fact that these writings, issuing from the disputation, are not adapted, from the systematic standpoint, to the didactic needs of "students of the sacred doctrine." He in no way questions their outstanding value for advanced theologians and for the discussion and more searching investigation of knotty

[21] *"Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zwischen der Summa Alexanders von Hales und dem hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Franziskanische Studien*, III (1916), p. 75.

individual problems from every angle. For the rest, the *Quaestiones disputatae* have a more systematic order than the *Quodlibeta*. The single portions of the *Quaestiones disputatae* of St. Thomas Aquinas (e. g., *De potentia*, *De malo*, *De spiritualibus creaturis*, *De anima*, etc.) give evidence of an organic arrangement, even though as an aggregate they do not constitute a uniform system. Scheeben [22] is inclined to range all the *Quaestiones disputatae* of Aquinas under three heads: *De ente et potentia*, *De veritate et cognitione*, *De bono et appetitu boni*, as forming a sufficiently complete system of theologico-philosophical ontology, epistemology, and ethics. However, neither the chronology of these *Quaestiones disputatae* nor their arrangement in the earliest manuscripts enables us to determine whether or not such systematization was intended by the Saint. We likewise find a more or less systematic order in the *Quaestiones disputatae* of St. Bonaventure, Matthew of Aquasparta, William of Falgar, John Peckham, Bernard of Trilia, etc. In these cases, however, there is always a question of the systematization of a relatively small section of the vast domain of Scholastic

[22] *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, Vol. I, p. 433. Cfr. also A. Portmann, *"Die Systematik in den Quaestiones disputatae des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spek. Theologie*, VI (1892), pp. 48 sqq., 127 sqq.

speculation, whereas "students of the sacred doctrine" require a finished, well-ordered conspectus of all speculative theology.

As their name indicates, the *Quaestiones de quolibet* have no systematic order in the strict sense, even though a certain general arrangement is announced at the head of each *Quodlibetum.* The richly diversified content of the *Quaestiones de quolibet* [23] reflects the free and easy character of the disputations held before Christmas and Easter, which received their redaction in the *Quodlibeta.* Here were discussed questions which could not be given sufficient attention during the regular period of instruction. Current theological questions and controversies were also treated in these disputations, in which a wide scope was allowed the students to select the questions. Several *Quodlibetarii* sought to put a little more order into their works; thus, for example, James of Viterbo begins his *Quodlibeta* with an introduction in which he attempts to discover some intrinsic connection between the various questions.[24] Later on the difference between the *Quaestiones disputatae* (*ordinariae*) and the *Quaestiones de quolibet* became more and more attenu-

[23] Cfr. P. Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320,* Le Saulchoir, 1925.

[24] I have examined the *Quodlibeta* of James of Viterbo in *Cod.* 363 of the University Library at Erlangen.

ated. All in all, this literature of the *Quaestiones*, whether *disputatae* or *quodlibetales*, was but little adapted to the needs and intellectual capacity of beginners in theology. One of the main reasons for this, as St. Thomas points out in the *Prologus* to his *Summa*, is the lack of a clear and logical order.

It is evident, then, that St. Thomas distinctly and accurately recognized the systematic faults attaching to commentaries on text-books—particularly to those on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard [25]—and to the literature of the *Quaestiones*, and thereby impeding the progress of "students of the sacred doctrine." But he did more: in an unrivalled manner he overcame these faults in his *Summa*, where he has created a theological synthesis of undisturbed harmony and perfect proportion, of perspicuous order and impressive architecture. In truth, every part, every treatise, every question, every article and every portion of the article is in the right place.

The systematization achieved by St. Thomas in his theological *Summa* consists of an *ex-*

[25] In his *Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Wissenschaft*, in Möhler's *Kirchengeschichte*, edited by Gams, Vol. II (Ratisbon, 1867), p. 554, Franz Brentano writes as follows on the relation of Aquinas to Peter the Lombard: "When compared with the marvelous order which here unites all theological science into a living organism, the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard appear as a crude and arbitrary conglomerate."

terior arrangement and an *interior development.* In the exterior organization and grouping of the vast material elaborated in this work, Aquinas manifests an incomparable technique and a superlative degree of logical acumen and lucidity. The systematic plan of the work is clearly indicated even to the last ramifications. At the head of the first part (I^a, q. 2 *init.*) the division of the entire work is announced. Every part, every treatise, every new section of the treatise, and every *quaestio* is preceded by a clear statement of its division. Students and commentators of the *Summa* are therefore fully justified in pointing out the inner coherence of the articles and the bearing of each article on the whole. The Dominican John of St. Thomas, one of the best interpreters of the *Summa*, introduces his commentary with an *Explicatio connexionis et ordinis totius Summae theologiae D. Thomae per omnes materias.*[26] In recent times P. Berthier, O.P., P. Gualindi, S.J., and Lyons have published systematic tables to the *Summa theologica.*[27] A. Portmann, B. Dörholt, and

[26] Cfr. Jean de Saint-Thomas, *Introduction à la théologie de saint Thomas. Traduction et notes de M. Benoit Lavaud, O.P.* (Paris, 1928).

[27] J. J. Berthier, O.P., *Tabulae systematicae et synopticae totius Summae Theologicae juxta ipsammet Doctoris Angelici methodum strictius et clarius exactae* (Fribourg, 1893); A. Gualindi, S.J., *Summa Theologica S. Thomae Doctoris Angelici*

in briefer form again P. Berthier, O.P., C. v. Schäzler and P. Kennedy have unfolded the systematic plan of the theological *Summa*.[28] When one examines more closely and in detail the order and grouping given to his subject-matter by St. Thomas, one becomes more and more aware how logically, neatly, and clearly everything is pondered and arranged; how natural, simple and in some measure self-evident is the manner in which everything progresses. Every step forward is linked with what precedes. Rarely is reference made to what follows. The train of thought and demonstration advances from the universal to the particular, from the known to the less known. This logical order and conformity to the laws of thought dominates the whole work and is also characteristic of the details. Many of the articles in their plan and entire structure are gems

uno schemate per ordinem quaestionum exhibita (2nd ed., Rome, 1881); Lyons, *La Somme de saint Thomas résumée en tableaux synoptiques* (Nizza, 1901); G. del Sasso, *Compendio della Somma Teologica di S. Tommaso d'Aquino* (Padua, 1923); Caelestinus a S. Joseph, O.C.D., *Tabulae synopticae Summae Theologiae D. Thomae* (Mariakerke, near Ghent, 1924).

[28] A. Portmann, *Das System der theologischen Summa des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (2nd ed., Lucerne, 1903); B. Dörholt, *Der Predigerorden und seine Theologie* (Paderborn, 1917); J. J. Berthier, O.P., *L'étude de la Somme Théologique de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (2nd ed. Paris, 1906); C. v. Schäzler, *Introductio in S. Theologiam dogmaticam ad mentem D. Thomae* (Ratisbon, 1882), pp. 292–338; D. J. Kennedy, O.P., *"The Summa Theol. of St. Thomas,"* in *Catholic University Bulletin,* 1909.

of systematization, whose perfection, proportion, and perspicuity delight us like a work of art.

One can well share the sentiments of the Dominican Antony Reginaldus,[29] who has lovingly delved into the profound connections of Thomistic teaching, when he writes: "The most excellent of all its qualities is this: so great is the consistency, so intimate the connection and, as it were, conglutination of all it teaches, that one thing follows from another with an almost incredible lucidity. It is true that our admiration is aroused by the order, method, and thoughts; but the harmonious blending of such a variety of things so captivates us that we find nothing more delightful. Everywhere the beginning agrees with the middle, and the end with both; and there is coherence throughout, so that whoever admits one proposition must admit all the rest at the risk of contradicting himself." The Dominican historian Bernard Guidonis, almost a contemporary of St. Thomas, recognized the systematic merits of the *Summa* and pointed them out in the following words: [30] "He also wrote a *Summa* of the whole of theology, enriched it with many articles and, otherwise than in his previous works,

[29] *Doctrinae S. Thomae Aquinatis tria principia cum suis consequentiis.* New edition (Paris, 1878), Preface.

[30] Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Fribourg, 1910), p. 67.

divided it according to the requirements of the subject-matter, and in an admirably appropriate order into questions and articles, which he demonstrated by keen arguments and confirmed by the authority of saintly doctors. By this work he rendered a great service to all who seek for theological knowledge, in that he devised and taught a hitherto unknown, easy, and succinct method of learning and understanding—and all this not without the gift of a special grace."

I cannot forego this opportunity of adding an exceptionally pertinent and impressive portrayal and appraisal of the systematic and logical advantages of the *Summa*, made by the Dominican Jerome Vielmius [31] in his instructive dissertation on the works of St. Thomas, written about the time of the Council of Trent. While his words are full of enthusiasm, they are also founded on sound, objective observation: "Even if I spoke with a hundred tongues, and all the members of my body were converted into tongues, and every joint were endowed with human utterance, yet I could not adequately set forth the excellence of this most magnificent work [i. e., the *Summa Theologica*], nor fittingly describe its greatness and majesty. The

[31] *De D. Thomae Aquinatis doctrina et scriptis* (Vienna, 1763), p. 144 sq.

things it discusses are divine, the thoughts are sublime, the doctrine is consistent and penetrating, the style terse and polished, the order most beautiful, the method incomparable. For, like the links of a chain, the questions are so conjoined as to be interdependent, the latter on the former, and to impart light and strength to one another. Hence, it always takes its starting-point from the better known, that is, from what has been previously explained and established. Everything is in its proper place; you will find no empty repetitions, nothing preposterous, superfluous, or redundant; nothing is mutilated or too concise, so that no excessive brevity engenders obscurity. Scholars unanimously agree that any addition to this most excellent and renowned volume would render it monstrous; any subtraction, defective and curtailed; any inversion, distorted and deformed."

The systematic order of the *Summa Theologica* is not only one of exterior arrangement, but also of *interior development*. Not only have the sharpness, clearness, and consequentialness of logical division given this doctrinal edifice its form and style, but also and above all the great theological and metaphysical ideas and viewpoints, which in their inferences and concatenations pervade and dominate the whole work, impart to the architec-

tonic structure of the theological *Summa* its intrinsic worth and profound meaning. The exterior order and division are only the vesture, as it were, the manifestation of the interior systematic consistency, growing out of an organic development of ideas. This spirit of synthesis, this reference of everything to principles and general viewpoints, is evident in the main division of the work, which is as deep as it is simple and clear: "Because the chief aim of sacred doctrine is to teach the knowledge of God, not only as He is in Himself, but also as He is the beginning of things and their last end, and especially of rational creatures; therefore, in our endeavor to expound this science, we shall first treat of God; secondly, of the rational creature's advance towards God; thirdly, of Christ, who, as man, is our way to God." (*Summa Theol.*, I^a, q. 2, *init.*). John of St. Thomas paraphrases this division as follows:[32] "As is evident from the beginning of the second question of this first part, St. Thomas divided the whole doctrine of the *Summa Theologica* according to this threefold consideration of God as cause, namely, as the efficient principle, as the final beatitude, as the Saviour and Redeemer. And thus from God in Himself and in His being, through

[32] *Cursus theologicus in Summam Theologicam D. Thomae*, new edition, Vol. I (Paris, 1883), p. 191.

God as the efficient, final, and saving cause, the return is made to God as the object of enjoyment in the ultimate glory of the resurrection—such is the truly golden circle of theology described by the sacred *Summa* of St. Thomas."

There is no doubt that to this division the *Summa* owes the systematic unity, concentration, and consistency which it possesses in a much higher degree than could be reached by the division of the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard or of the pre-Thomistic theological *Summae*, which were more or less influenced by that work. Even the somewhat later *Summa* of Ulric of Strasburg, the division of which was *not* inspired by the work of Peter the Lombard, does not show the same degree of systematic unity and compactness.[33] Throughout the composition and elaboration of his *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas consistently adhered to his teaching that God is the "*subjectum sacrae doctrinae:*" "In sacred science all things are treated of under the formality of God; either because they are God Himself, or because they refer to God as their beginning

[33] On the systematization of the *Summa* of Ulric of Strasburg, see M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, pp. 186–196; G. Théry, O.P., *"Originalité du plan de la "Summa de bono" d'Ulric de Strasbourg,"* in *Revue Thomiste*, 1922, pp. 376–397.

and end" (I^a, q. 1, art. 7). We have neither time nor space to enter into a detailed description and evaluation of the ways and means whereby, on the basis of this uniform and broad main division, St. Thomas constructed his system and gave it its finishing touches. A few remarks must suffice. The separation of the general treatise on God from that on the Trinity is carried out with a fine sense for method. The doctrine on God is dominated by broad metaphysical viewpoints, and in the weightiness and compactness of its metaphysical speculation it strikes our amazed mental vision like a mighty mountain chain towering towards heaven. With what logical sequence he deduces the attributes of God from the very proofs for His existence! (I^a, q. 2, art. 3).[34] The speculative treatise on the Trinity is constructed on the profound doc-

[34] Cl. Baeumker gives a beautiful description of the systematic arrangement of the treatise on God in the *Summa Theologica,* especially as it is manifested in the original utilization of sources: "Like those cathedrals of the Middle Ages which, like that of Strasburg, were begun in the Romanesque period and finished in the Gothic, this marvelous edifice, especially as it appears in its most compact form in the first forty-three questions of the theological *Summa* of Aquinas, combines Augustinian ideas, so majestically serene and yet so warm with life, with dialectics and the bold onward march of its Aristotelian ideas." *Das pseudo-hermetische "Buch der vierundzwanzig Meister,"* in *Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag, Georg Freiherrn von Hertling gewidmet* (Freiburg, 1913), p. 19.

trine of the intra-trinitarian *processiones*. In the treatise on Creation, in that on God's relation to the world, the Thomistic concept of creation, itself founded on the idea of God, is analyzed and applied with inexorable logic, so that the divine causality is grasped in all its depth and bearing.

The division and internal logic of the *Summa Theologica* is most pervasive in the treatise on morals. Taking as his standpoint the truth that God is the final cause of the rational creature, or of "the rational creature's advance towards God," St. Thomas fashioned the whole subject-matter into a monumental work, which impressed his contemporaries as a powerful achievement in the ethical domain. In the *Continuatio* IV of the *Chronica minor auctore Minorita Erphordiensi*—hence not a Dominican or Thomist source—we read:[35] "Item magister Thomas, clarum Dei organum in theologia et in naturalibus et *praecipue* in moralibus." A token of the great esteem in which this part of the *Summa Theologica* was held by the oldest Thomistic school is the fact that as early as 1288 an abridgment of the *Secunda* was made by the Dominican Galienus Ozto. In our time, too, the *Secunda* of Aquinas is highly valued and admired as the first scientific system of Christian ethics.

[35] *M. G. H., SS.*, XXIV, 211.

Thus, for example, J. B. v. Hirscher writes:[36] "The first, however, to present Christian moral teaching in a systematic form was Thomas Aquinas. He first established the general ethical ideas and principles, which he then applied to the particular domains of morality." W. Gass,[37] who makes a very suggestive, though not always unobjectionable, analysis and appraisal of the *Secunda*, likewise calls St. Thomas the first thorough and systematic exponent of ethics, and points out in terms of warm praise that in the system of the theological *Summa* moral theology "appears not as a meager appendage to dogmatic theology, but as the second half of theology and ecclesiastical science in general." Because of the latest researches and findings, I must add that twenty years before the composition of the *Secunda*, Albert the Great, in the third unpublished part ("*De bono sive de virtutibus*") of his *Summa de creaturis*, had conceived an elaborated moral theology—in a simpler style, it is true—as an independent wing of a philosophico-theological edifice.

We may well regard the Second Part of the *Summa* as the masterpiece of the synthetic skill of St. Thomas. "Nowhere," remarks M. Baumgart-

[36] *Die christliche Moral*, Vol. I (Tübingen, 1845), p. 65.

[37] *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, Vol. I (Berlin, 1880), pp. 338, 348.

ner,[38] "does his unique talent for synthesis shine more brilliantly than in the domain of ethics." In this field there were special difficulties to overcome. It was necessary to view the manifold aspects of concrete human life and conduct in the light of the Christian ethos. Hence, in the introduction to the *Secunda Secundae* St. Thomas rightly remarks: "General discourses on morals are of little use because actions are concerned with particulars." As a matter of fact, the great Scholastic assigned an important rôle to experience, to the investigation of pulsating moral life with all its circumstances and ramifications, its helps and hindrances, its dangers and contrasts, and he made an abundance of remarkable observations. Simon Deploige [39] has proved this convincingly from the sources, particularly in regard to social ethics.

It is precisely this multiplicity of aspects and the individual character presented by actual moral life and conduct that creates great difficulties for the synthetic method, aspiring as it does to achieve uni-

[38] *Thomas von Aquin,* in E. v. Aster, *Grosse Denker,* Vol. I (Leipsic, 1911), p. 311. See also, M. Grabmann, *Thomas von Aquin* (5th ed., Kempten and Munich, 1926), pp. 127–137.—There is a good English translation of this work by Dr. Virgil Michel, O.S.B., *St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York and London, 1928). (Tr.)

[39] *Le conflit de la morale et de la sociologie* (3rd ed., Louvain, 1923); J. Mausbach, *Thomas von Aquin als Meister christlicher Sittenlehre* (Munich, 1925).

versal laws, profound views, and perspicuous surveys. St. Thomas has overcome these obstacles in a brilliant fashion; he has proved himself a master in combining analysis with synthesis, in enlisting observation into the service of his powerful metaphysico-theological speculation, thus creating a system of morality ingeniously organized even to the last details, and yet true to life, a system theoretical as well as practical. W. Gass remarks:[40] "The vast development of the systematic plan enables us to reach even the most distant points; on the one side we find prayer, contemplation, vision; on the other, we behold a manifold moral empiricism, with all the difficulties and vicissitudes of practical life. Nowhere, however, does the author let the guiding threads slip out of his fingers. Everything finds a fitting place in his filigree-work; and as he defines ethics to be the science of acts, so he gives due prominence to the active factor everywhere; it must not be lacking anywhere, neither in the movements of reason and the will, nor in the exalted state of religious contemplation. What is general is put into relation with an abundance of particulars, the logical and imperative train of thought is supplemented by descriptions. In some measure St. Thomas already made preparations for the task

[40] *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik,* Vol. I, p. 348.

which modern ethics has set for itself, namely, to show that all the aspects of life are susceptible of being brought in contact with the moral law and influenced by it." A. Rietter,[41] one of the best exponents of the moral teaching of St. Thomas, expresses a similar opinion: "The manner in which St. Thomas combined many and diversified elements into one whole, while at the same time devoting the utmost pains and attention to details, is truly admirable."

Finally, both an innovation and a decided improvement in systematization are evident also in the Third Part of the *Summa Theologica*, the content of which the main division quoted above announces in these terms: "Thirdly [we shall treat] of Christ, who, as man, is our way to God." St. Thomas joined the treatise on the Incarnation immediately to that on the Sacraments, and organically combined both in one part of the *Summa*. His profound conception of the being, influence, and work of the God-Man gave a Christological coloring to his doctrine on the Sacraments. From Christ's divinity and through the medium of His humanity as the instrument of His divinity the Sacraments derive their grace-dispensing efficacy. "Indeed, no other theologian has penetrated as deeply as St.

[41] *Die Moral des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Munich, 1858), p. 50.

Thomas into the mysterious economy of the theandric constitution and treasures of charismata in the God-Man." [42]

These are but a few sketchy indications of the systematization of the theological *Summa*, of its perspicuous logical arrangement and inner structure, intelligible from the richness and depth of ideas furnished by metaphysical and theological speculation. St. Thomas has avoided the methodic faults attaching to earlier and contemporaneous Scholastic works and hindering the progress of "students of the sacred doctrine": in his *Summa Theologica* he has created an unrivaled masterpiece of synthesis. Because of its systematization and architectonic structure the theological *Summa* has been appropriately compared to the Gothic cathedrals of the thirteenth century.

"The *Summa* of the immortal Thomas Aquinas," writes K. Werner,[43] "is the most magnificent production of medieval scholarship; the systematization of Augustinian theology has here reached its

[42] C. v. Schäzler, *Die Lehre von der Wirksamkeit der Sakramente ex opere operato* (Munich, 1860), p. 100; Fr. Morgott, *Der Spender der hl. Sakramente nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Freiburg, 1886), pp. 22 sqq.; M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin von der Kirche als Gotteswerk* (Ratisbon, 1903), pp. 240, sqq.; Ch. V. Héris, O.P., *Le Mystère du Christ* (Paris, 1928).

[43] *System der christlichen Ethik,* Vol. I (Ratisbon, 1850), pp. 47 sq.

perfection. A constructive advance beyond it was no longer possible within the same point of view. In its sublime and well pondered architectonic it constitutes a temple of Christian learning in whose majestic courts are set up the stately statues of all the great witnesses of God who, beginning with the Apostle of the Gentiles, have proclaimed the mysteries of the Eternal throughout the centuries. And as the prophetic spirit of the mighty Dante did not disdain to be guided through the eternal spaces by the sage Virgil, the poet abounding in pure beauty and inviolate youth of mind, so in this hallowed temple, a true spiritual image of the Cosmos conceived by God, the human wisdom of a Plato and an Aristotle is invited to render homage to the glory of the Lord whose spirit enlightens all that seek Him. Thus this work was to manifest all God had revealed to the Church of His election, and also all that which outside of her He had brought to the knowledge of the pagan world; and it was made known to the Christian world which, after a brief period of vacillation, recognized it as a work in which Christ Himself took delight—for was it not His light and His peace that pervaded and illuminated it and thence radiated strength and inspiration into all souls? Even to-day . . . it must be admitted that since the time of St. Thomas no work

has been produced which constitutes a whole so harmoniously finished, so secure in its completeness, so eminently objective in its attitude as his *Summa Theologica*. And so, like the Gothic cathedrals replete with the sublimity and richness of a profoundly religious art, this work remains a lasting monument of perfect orthodoxy and will claim the loving admiration and sedulous study of all future generations."

3. *Avoidance of Repetitions.—Novelty and Progress in the "Theological Summa."*

Finally, St. Thomas points out a third fault of method attaching to Scholastic works and constituting an obstacle to the progress of the "*novitii sacrae doctrinae*:" "Partim quidem, quia eorundem frequens repetitio et fastidium et confusionem generabat in animis auditorum." The Angelic Doctor here declared himself against the frequent and futile repetition of the same topics in the oral teaching as well as in the writings of the Scholastics, because it engendered weariness and confusion in the minds of hearers and readers. This defect is intimately connected with the two foregoing. The theological professor or author who delights in idle questions, who is given to prolixity and lacks the

sense of brevity, precision, and lucidity, will also indulge in repetitions and tire his hearers or readers by returning time and again to the same subject. The same fault will also be committed by one who brings no order, no system, into his lectures and writings. He will perforce discuss the same thing a number of times. The shortcomings described in preceding sections as inherent in textbooks, particularly in the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, naturally affected the commentaries on these works, so that very frequently they branched out into useless repetitions. In the literature of the *Questions*, especially in the *Quodlibetalia*, it is not rare to find the same question proposed several times.

By the very fact that he sought to attain the greatest possible precision and clearness, and assigned to every subject its logical place in a system maturely pondered even to its most remote ramifications, St. Thomas avoided all bootless and tiresome repetitions. But it is chiefly by dividing the treatise on morals into a general and a special one that he masterfully obviated the danger of unavailing and annoying repetitions lurking there. Rarely does Aquinas speak twice of the same subject *ex professo*. He does so, for example, apropos of the

Baptism of Jewish children. In II^a II^{ae}, q. 10, art. 12, the question is put: "*Utrum pueri Iudaeorum et aliorum infidelium sint invitis parentibus baptizandi.*" In III^a, q. 68, art. 10, the same question is repeated in the same words. But an accurate comparison of the two articles will not permit us to charge St. Thomas with a useless repetition. The body of the first-mentioned article, where the question is proposed in connection with the sin of unbelief, is quite different in content from that of the second, which treats the same question in its relation to the doctrine of Baptism. A repetition is noted only in two objections and their solutions. The three objections of the second mentioned article are taken over from the first, which contains still others. In reference to this repetition Bañez remarks:[44] "Verum si attente consideras, multo brevius egit in tertia parte et aliquid novi adjiciens quam in secunda secundae disseruerat." The editors of the Leonine edition have inserted both articles in the text of the *Summa theologica;* but in their preface to the new edition of the *Summa contra Gentiles* they have expressed the opinion that article 12 of the II^a II^{ae}, q. 10, is an interpola-

[44] *Scholastica Commentaria in Primam Partem Doctoris Angelici S. Thomae Aquinatis* (Lyons, 1588): *In D. Thomae prooemium meditatio.*

tion because this article is found verbatim in *Quodlib.* 2, art. 7.[45]

The solicitude which St. Thomas shows in his Prologue to avoid repetitions suggests a further aim, to which William of Tocco draws attention. I mean the effort of the great Scholastic to arouse and hold the interest of readers and thus to stimulate tyros in theology by giving proof of *originality*, whether in the presentation of new material of knowledge, or in the manner of stating questions, or in the linkage of ideas and demonstrations. The *Commentaries on the Sentences* and the *Summae* composed before the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, frequently present a homogeneous and very monotonous aspect. The same questions are but too regularly discussed and solved by means of the same authorities and the same reasons. The objections and difficulties are in large measure borrowed and handed down from one author to another. Not rarely entire articles or at least important fragments thereof are taken over verbatim. The new edition of the *Summa Theologiae* of Alexander of Hales shows that he borrowed extensively word for word from the *Summae* of Philip of Grève and William of Auxerre. The comparative

[45] *S. Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita, tom.* XIII: *Summa contra Gentiles* (Rome, 1918), *Praefatio*, p. XXIII.

investigations of these relations of dependence between various authors, to which P. Parthenius Minges has made some good contributions, will still further disclose this "*eorundem frequens repetitio.*"

It is not to be denied, however, that St. Thomas likewise made use of the works of earlier Scholastics, and discussed the same problems as they did. But he never borrowed verbatim, and whatever he did take over from his models, particularly into the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologica*, bears the stamp of his originality and genius. He offered much that is new both in matter and manner, especially in his theological *Summa*, and previously in his *Summa contra Gentiles*. Here we can give only some general proofs for this statement. A closer study of the *Prima* will reveal many viewpoints and demonstrations that are new. I refer here only to the section on psychology (I^a, q. 75–89). By its metaphysical depth and finish, the treatise on God and Creation shows novelty and progress when compared with earlier *Summae* and commentaries on the *Sentences*. We need, for example, only replace in their historical setting the proofs for the existence of God (I^a, q. 2) and compare them with the teaching of earlier and contemporary Scholastics on the same subject, in order to

be impressed with the fact that they are new and more finished, particularly from the standpoint of method and technique.[46] On the attitude of St. Thomas towards St. Anselm's argument for the existence of God, Baeumker [47] justly remarks that "here, too, Aquinas does not feebly put together the old and the new, even when the old is no longer tenable, but resolutely abandons the old that has broken down—the purely conceptual proof of God—in order to replace it with the new—the proof from causality."

That the *Prima* with its metaphysical orientation is not a repetition of traditional Scholasticism, but that precisely in the utilization and development of Aristotelian philosophy it has trodden new and unaccustomed ways, is proved by the reaction of Scholastic Augustinianism at the end of the thirteenth century, which was directed chiefly against the theses and theories of this first part of the *Summa*. Of the one hundred and twenty Thomistic theses criticized by the *Correctorium Fratris Thomae* of the Franciscan William de la Mare, not less than forty-nine are taken from the *Prima*.

It is the second part (*Secunda*), however, which is

[46] Cfr. Baeumker, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 1908, p. 132.

[47] *Witelo*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, Vol. III, 2 (Münster, 1908), p. 302.

most original. By its scope and freedom of manner it marks, from the systematic standpoint, a most remarkable step in advance, when compared with the earlier treatment of ethical problems. Moreover, Alexander of Hales [48] and Albert the Great in the unpublished third part of his *Summa de creaturis* ("De bono sive de virtutibus"), were not yet able to incorporate in their systematic treatise on virtue the entire *Nicomachaean Ethics*, *Politics*, and *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, and other sources known and used by St. Thomas. Th. Pègues [49] is quite right in regarding the second part of the theological *Summa* as "the most original, and in a sense the best achievement of the genius of St. Thomas." By the extent

[48] To Alexander of Hales is also attributed the voluminous *Summa de virtutibus*, printed in Paris by Jean Petit in 1509. It is certainly not the work of Alexander of Hales, but quite probably of his pupil, William of Melitona, O.F.M. The remark found on the last page of the printed edition: "In qua originaliter pene omnia, quae in secunda secundae sanctus Thomas collegit, habentur," which was previously advanced against the independence of the *Secunda Secundae*, is absolutely without foundation, for "the two works are wholly different in plan and execution." Cfr. P. Ignatius Jeiler, O.F.M., "*Die sogenannte Summa de virtutibus des Alexander von Hales*," in *Katholik*, 1879, Vol. I, pp. 38–54 (especially pp. 52 sqq.), and *S. Bonaventurae Opera*, ed. Quaracchi, Vol. I, pp. LVII–LXII.

[49] *Commentaire français littéral de la Somme théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Vol. VI (Toulouse-Paris, 1911), Avant-Propos, p. VI.—On the originality of the second part of the *Summa*, see also V. McNabb, O.P., "*St. Thomas and Moral Theology*," in *Xenia Thomistica*, Vol. II (Rome, 1925), pp. 187–202.

of the sources utilized, by the number of its observations, by the perspicuity and logic of its systematic plan, by its philosophical depth, the second part of the *Summa* surpasses the expositions of moral teaching in the systematic works of other Scholastics and, compared with them, presents a host of new ideas. From among the other theological *Summae*, only that of Ulric of Strasburg can be adduced for purposes of comparison; its sixth book contains an extensive, though unfinished, treatise on morals, to all appearances written independently of St. Thomas, but inferior to his achievement in form and content.

Here I can give only a rough outline and a few instances of the new features with which St. Thomas has enriched the second part of his *Summa*. In the first place, I may mention the treatise *De passionibus* (I^a II^{ae}, q. 22–48), the most complete and most substantial study of the emotions left us by medieval Scholasticism. It is enough to compare this exposition of the Angelic Doctor with the thorough study of the passions made by Albert the Great in the unpublished section on the virtues which forms part of his *Summa de creaturis*, in order to become convinced that St. Thomas is not satisfied with repeating what others have thought and said before

him, but contributes much that is new.[50] The same holds true of the penetrating treatise *De habitibus*, which immediately follows. From the profusion of original features, whether of content or form, contained in the *Secunda Secundae*, we point out only the extensive treatise on the ideals of the religious life ($II^a\ II^{ae}$, q. 186–189).

The third part (*Tertia*) of the *Summa* takes up new problems and furnishes new demonstrations

[50] In his *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik* (Vol. I, p. 332), W. Gass makes the following observations on the Thomistic doctrine on the passions: "Side by side with the *ethos* must be considered the *pathos*. The introduction of this study into the subject-matter of ethics is an advance. Thomas is gripped by the variegated spectacle of the life of the passions; he seeks to disentangle and analyze it, even if only by means of an artificial schematization. Each element is studied in its subject and object, in its cause and effect; the mechanical repetition of the same operations is tiresome, but in this monotonous exposition there is also an abundance of penetrating observations."—The repetitions here mentioned are not real repetitions, but the repeated application of the same methodical process to objects kindred in content, but always new. Such "repetition" serves the real progress of thought. It is precisely the "abundance of penetrating observations," recognized by Gass, that renders these repetitions less wearisome, especially for one who is aware of the fitness and logical perspicuity of this method. For the rest, modern expositions of problems in experimental psychology with their reports on repeated experiments are surely no less fatiguing than the treatise of Aquinas on the passions. But the detailed development of the experimental processes serves as a sure basis of valuable results of research, and thereby ceases to give the adept reader the disagreeable impression of repetition.

both in the treatise on the Incarnation—for example, in the questions on the knowledge of Christ (III[a], q. 9–12), in many sections of the treatise *De mysteriis Christi*—and in that on the Sacraments. The arguments from fitness, in particular, enriched by an intensive study of the Fathers, shows a large measure of originality. The metaphysical depth of the doctrine on the Eucharist (III[a], q. 75–77) is in many respects new in comparison with earlier works on this mystery. To verify this assertion, we need only compare these expositions of Aquinas with the parallel explanations, undoubtedly also quite profound, in St. Bonaventure's *Commentary on the Sentences.* The scientific progress and new orientation in the third part of the *Summa* are also due to the utilization of new sources. The commentaries of St. John Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Alexandria impart greater depth to the Christology, the Soteriology, and the doctrine of the Sacraments in the *Tertia.*

For the rest, already the contemporaries and pupils of St. Thomas were impressed with the originality, progressiveness, and independence characterizing the lectures and writings of the great Doctor. His biographer, William of Tocco,[51] who

[51] *Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis,* cap. XIV, ed. Pruemmer, p. 81: "Erat enim novos in sua lectione movens articulos, novum

was personally close to him as a pupil, has brought out in strong relief the extent of the originality of St. Thomas: "He introduced *new* articles into his lectures, adopted a *new* and clear method of scientific research and synthesis, and developed *new* proofs in his demonstrations. Every one who thus heard him teaching *new* things and solving doubts and difficulties with *new* reasons, could not but believe that God had illumined this thinker with the rays of a *new* light." To this early testimony we may add that of a theologian of our time, whose opinion is especially valuable because of his marvelous knowledge of published and unpublished Scholastic works. P. Ignatius Jeiler, O.F.M.,[52] emphasizes the originality in the manner of exposition found in the works of the Angelic Doctor in these terms: "All the writings of St. Thomas, particularly the theological *Summa*, are of a type so original by reason of their peerless nicety of expression and pregnant style, and so remarkably independent, that no one could imitate them or serve as their model."

modum et clarum determinandi inveniens, et novas adducens in determinationibus rationes; ut nemo qui ipsum audisset nova docere, et novis rationibus dubia diffinire, dubitaret, quod eum Deus novi luminis radiis illustrasset."

[52] *"Die sogenannte Summa de virtutibus des Alexander von Hales,"* in *Katholik,* 1879, Vol. I, p. 52.

IV. INFLUENCE OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA*—ITS RELIGIOUS CHARACTER.

The foregoing pages have made clear that in his Prologue St. Thomas informed his readers, in terms as concise as they are rich in meaning, about the didactic purpose which guided him in the composition of his theological *Summa*, and the means he resolved to employ for realizing his design. These means he explains by pointing out the didactic faults and deficiencies of method frequently attaching to Scholastic works, precisely as regards the needs of young students of theology. St. Thomas has indicated these defects with clear and trenchant strokes; he has avoided and overcome them in the most decisive manner; he has so fully, lucidly, and harmoniously developed the qualities of method opposed to them that his theological *Summa* has become the unrivalled classical manual of speculative theology for all time.

Aquinas concludes his Prologue with these words: "Endeavoring to avoid these and other like faults, we shall try, by God's help, to set forth whatever is included in this sacred science as briefly and clearly as the matter itself may allow." From this concluding passage we shall select for a brief reflection the expressions "as the matter itself may allow" and

"by God's help" (*cum confidentia divini auxilii*), for they suggest ideas, aims, and conceptions which are calculated to complete the view of the method outlined in the Prologue and applied in the composition of the *Summa*.

The words "as the matter itself may allow" imply a certain limitation and precision which are to place in its proper light and guard against misinterpretation the promise of brevity, simplicity, and clearness made by the author to "students of the sacred doctrine." Even though St. Thomas wishes to remain loyal to his didactic purpose and so to give an exposition of the whole content of theology that will be as simple, as precise and lucid, as orderly and substantial as possible, nevertheless the very depth and difficulty of the sacred science constrain him to eschew every superficial and popularizing form of exposition that passes lightly over the more knotty problems. Such is the meaning of the limiting clause, "as the matter itself may allow." On this point Cardinal Cajetan makes the following remark:[53] "This work is said to be suitable for beginners not by reason of a facility to be found in a shallow, sketchy, or introductory treatise, but because superfluities have been cut out, repetitions

[53] *S. Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII edita.* Vol. IV: *Pars Prima Summae theologicae cum Commentariis Thomae de Vio Cajetani, O.Pr.* (Rome, 1888), p. 5.

omitted, and a most beautiful order introduced; for as appears in the sequel, all theological problems are here appropriately and clearly treated."

In his theological *Summa* St. Thomas has brought into play all his didactic and methodical skill in order to initiate beginners and tyros into the depths of speculative theology along the safest way. He has understood how to fashion his work for the *incipientes*, for the *novitii sacrae doctrinae*, in such a manner that also the *provecti*, the proficient theologians, and all who choose speculative theology as the ideal of their intellectual life, may ever discover new treasures of knowledge by searching the pages of the *Summa*. This monumental work is one of those rare books for which understanding and love grow in the measure in which diligent study is devoted to it.

When one has repeatedly perused the theological *Summa* as a whole, when one has penetrated more thoroughly into the various problems it discusses, when one has delved into the other works of Aquinas, when one has taken the pains to study the writings and doctrines of the Saint in the light of the works of other great Scholastics, when one has made himself familiar with the earliest pupils of the prince of Scholasticism and with later commentators of his *Summa*, when, finally, one has investigated the re-

lations existing between the Thomistic world of ideas and modern thought—in a word, when one makes of the *Summa Theologica* the center of the intensive intellectual labor of a life-time—then one will never be satiated or fatigued by reading and studying this work, but will always take it up with new intellectual pleasure and profit; then, as a result of this experience, one will avow with the classical commentator of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, the general of the Dominicans, Francis Sylvestris of Ferrara:[54] "Nunquam Thomam Aquinatem conveni, quin abierim doctior eiusque amantior."

Now I shall let a theologian of the nineteenth century speak, for his own rich experience qualifies him to confirm what has just been said. Joseph Kleutgen, S.J.,[55] says about the theological depth of St. Thomas, as revealed in his *Summa:* "But what makes this quality all the more wonderful is precisely that which conceals it from the eyes of many: in St. Thomas depth of thought is combined with the utmost simplicity and brevity of exposition. A cursory reading will not disclose his profundity; sustained study is indispensable for this purpose.

[54] *Commentarius in libros quattuor contra Gentiles Sancti Thomae Aquinatis. Auctoris nuncupatoria epistola Sancto Patri Clementi VII Pont. Max.*

[55] *Die Theologie der Vorzeit,* Vol. IV (Münster, 1860), pp. 93 sq.

When one has often pored over the extensive investigations his commentators make on a question which St. Thomas answers in a few sentences, or when one has devoted prolonged reflection to the matter, and subsequently returns to the text of the holy Doctor from which one started, then and then only does one discover what treasures of thought lie hidden beneath the modest vesture of a few words. One is astonished to find contained in the words of St. Thomas as in a germ what one believed to have gained from the discoveries of others or as the fruit of one's own reflections: and then one realizes that one has been accompanied and guided by him along the ways on which one thought to be walking alone. Then his words and phrases, pondered anew, solve the still remaining difficulties and readily arrange into a unified whole the manifold ideas hovering before the mind."

St. Thomas writes his theological *Summa* "with trust in God's help." Satolli [56] explains these words of the Prologue as follows: "Sic modestiam animae prae se fert ac spem praesentis Dei, qui singulari abundantia suae lucis iam diu mentem Angelici perfuderat praecipue ad Summam hanc theolo-

[56] *In Summam Theologicam D. Thomae Aquinatis praelectiones*, Vol. I (Rome, 1884), p. 18.

gicam conficiendam." He had the sublime conception of theology as "quaedam impressio scientiae divinae, quae est una et simplex omnium" (*Summa Theol.*, I^a q. 1, art. 3), as a participation in the heavenly knowledge of God and the Saints—an idea which, according to an acceptable interpretation, also inspired the *Disputa* of Raphael. In the great Scholastic's pious soul, wholly devoted to God, this concept became an exceptionally strong confirmation of his conviction that the fully developed human intellect stands in very special need of the help of grace for the proper apprehension, assimilation, and exposition of the *sacra doctrina* or theology. Theoretically he stressed the importance and power of these supernatural factors for penetrating into the divine mysteries as far as this is possible here below. It is particularly on the gifts of the Holy Ghost that he relies for the help needed to realize his high ideal of a theologian. The gift of understanding elevates the mind to a deep and sure knowledge of the supernatural; the gift of wisdom renders the soul capable of an intuitive knowledge and intimate experience of divine truth—a kind of foretaste of the beatific vision—flowing from the loving kinship of nature with the divine, which is effected in us by charity ("*connaturalitas ad res*

divinas per caritatem"; II[a] II[ae], q. 45, art. 2).[57] Thus mystical considerations have a place in the speculative theology of Scholasticism.

But the picture we find in the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas, with its decided bent for a clear and precise presentation of truth, is not so rich in warm tonalities and mystical colors as the writings of St. Bonaventure [58] and, here and there, those of Albert the Great. And yet, on closer examination, we often find numerous passages of the theological *Summa* containing very short phrases which are a striking revelation of the pure, rich, and deep interior life of the great Saint, whose piety made such a powerful impression on his contemporaries, and is so vividly described by William of Tocco. These passages of the theological *Summa*, where one feels the vibrations of a mystical soul, have been impressively grouped in the ascetical works of the Dominican theologians Chardon, Piny, and Massoulié, in the *Treatise on the Love of God* (*Theotimus*) of St. Francis de Sales, in the *Théologie an-*

[57] See the profound explanation of the teaching of St. Thomas on the gifts of understanding and wisdom, given by John of St. Thomas, O.P., *Cursus theologicus in Summam Theologicam D. Thomae*, new edition, Vol. VI (Paris, 1885), pp. 603–650.

[58] In his work, *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (St. Louis and Cambridge, England, 1924), pp. 279 and 282, note 4, E. Gilson calls attention to this contrast as seen in the prayer of St. Thomas and in that of St. Bonaventure, inserted in the Breviary as part of the priest's thanksgiving after Mass. (Tr.)

gélique of Hauteville, in the *Théologie affective* of Bail of the Sorbonne, in the *Theologia mentis et cordis* of the Dominican Vincent Contenson—to mention only a few of the most important among the older authors. The theory of the contemplative life or of Christian mysticism which is developed in the *Secunda Secundae* influenced the Spanish mysticism of the sixteenth century.[59]

However, the words of the Prologue "*cum confidentia divini auxilii*" are not only the expression of a theoretical conviction; they also remind us that, in practice, St. Thomas took this divine help into account by intimately uniting science with piety. As William of Tocco [60] informs us on the authority of Reginald of Piperno, whenever the Saint prepared to study, discuss, lecture, write or dictate his works, he retired for fervent prayer and with tears implored God's help. The same biographer relates a number of instances in which our Saint gave expression to this "trust in God's help" by having recourse to prayer during the composition of his various works. To his faithful friend and inseparable companion, Reginald of Piperno, St.

[59] J. Arintero, O.P., *Influencia de S. Tomás en la mistica de S. Juan de la Cruz y S. Teresa. Vida sobrenatural,* 7 (1924), pp. 165–182.

[60] Cfr. *Guillelmi de Tocco Vita S. Thomae Aquinatis,* ch. 30, ed. Pruemmer, p. 105.

Thomas avowed that he owed his knowledge not so much to his own study and endeavor, but rather to divine assistance.[61] It is true, however, that Aquinas was not lacking in earnest personal efforts. The autograph of his *Summa contra Gentiles* in the Vatican library, with its numerous cancellations, corrections, marginal notes, etc., is a visible proof of this. In this same autograph one also finds marginal notes which breathe the religious sentiments of the author and his lively "trust in divine help."

St. Thomas secured this divine help for his great theological work by an intimate union with Jesus Christ. For him all heavenly wisdom and science, for which his soul yearned so fervently, were contained in Christ: "As one who possessed a book containing all knowledge would seek for nothing but to know that book, so we should seek for nothing but Christ" (*Comment. in Ep. ad Coloss. cap. 2, lect.* 1). So the first and the second part of the *Summa* conclude with a brief and fervent praise of Jesus Christ, "qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in saecula. Amen."

In all times the religious character attaching to the personality and entire work of St. Thomas [62]

[61] *Ibid.*

[62] In his excellent biography, *La Vie de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1737), pp. 373–592, A. Touron, O.P., has thoroughly investigated the relations between the religious life and the

has exercised a peculiar charm over pious souls; it has urged them to follow him, not only in his sublime and deep thoughts, but also in his rich and pure interior life, and so to realize in themselves the idea expressed by the Church in the prayer for his feast: "that we may both understand what he taught and imitate what he practiced." [63]

scientific activities of St. Thomas. A very engaging study of the Saint is found in the little known book of an Italian Dominican, *Il Sole d'Aquino contemplato nelle sue virtù principali* (Genoa, 1875).—M. Grabmann, *Das Seelenleben des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (2nd ed., Munich, 1924).

[63] On this point P. Coconnier, O.P., writes: "However, he will be truly worthy of the master who does not rest satisfied with following St. Thomas in his doctrine, but also walks in his footsteps on the path of virtue: who reproduces in himself his humility and sweet kindness, his detachment from the world, his assiduity in prayer, his apostolic zeal, his fervent love for God, the God of the Cross and of the Holy Eucharist, his tender devotion to the Mother of the Word Incarnate. Surely, such a one will be a perfect disciple, and no one will hesitate to recognize and hail him as a true Thomist." (In *Revue Thomiste*, I (1893), p. 26.)

Chapter III

THE EXPOSITION AND UTILIZATION OF THE THEOLOGICAL *SUMMA* OF ST. THOMAS

I. METHOD OF INTERPRETING THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA*

To make this *Introduction to the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas* more complete, I wish to add a few brief remarks on the manner of explaining and commenting upon this work. It seems to me that the ideal interpretation of St. Thomas is the one founded on the deepest possible knowledge of the personality, ideas, and sentiments of this great Christian thinker and Saint; the one which consists in reproducing and re-experiencing in some way, in *ensemble* and in detail, what he meant, wished, and thought in his theological *Summa*. It is for this reason that we have devoted so much attention in our Introduction to the "*propositum intentionis in hoc opere*," to the aims and intentions

which the author himself has set forth in the Prologue to his work.

In endeavoring to outline a method for the interpretation of St. Thomas, and especially of his *Summa Theologica*, we must first of all consider the *systematic study* of the work. This seeks to establish the meaning and ideas of each article, to see them in all their aspects, and so to reach a thorough understanding of the doctrine contained in the whole work. First and foremost this method keeps to the letter of the individual articles, and its primary aim is to find their place in the general plan. The arrangement and logical linkage of the articles, questions, treatises, and parts of the theological *Summa* must be etched in deep and clear-cut lines on the mind of the student. In the explanation of each article the exact meaning of its title is set forth, and so the import of the "*Utrum*"—of the question proposed—is accurately determined. The content of the body of the article is then clearly disclosed by developing the philosophical and theological presuppositions and ideas which have a bearing on the solution of the question, by precisely formulating in one or more theses or conclusions the answer or solution given by St. Thomas, and by verifying in all their rigor the proofs he adduces in its favor. Finally, as regards the objections

which St. Thomas brings forward at the beginning of the article and refutes on the basis of the *responsio principalis*, in a dialectical commentary on the *Summa* they are usually formulated and answered *in forma*, that is, in syllogistic form. This analysis of the text of St. Thomas, undertaken with logical means, this *elucidatio formalis* of each article, recommended in the programme of studies of the Dominican Order and applied with predilection by the Dominican commentators, has the indisputable advantage of concentrating attention on the text itself and of providing a thorough knowledge of the interior and exterior structure of the *Summa*.

The next step in the systematic method of interpretation consists in utilizing the other works of St. Thomas for the elucidation of the theological *Summa*.[1] I can be brief here, for in a preceding section, when treating of the place the *Summa* occupies in the series of the works of St. Thomas, I have already discussed in detail the historical foundations of this method, which the Dominican theologian A. Massoulié has expressed by the formula: "*Divus Thomas sui interpres.*" The correct and fruitful application of this method demands, in the first place, that we utilize only the authentic writings of

[1] On this point see the noteworthy expositions of J. de Guibert, S.J., *Les doublets de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1926).

St. Thomas and hence know accurately which belong to this class; secondly, account must also be taken of the chronology of Thomistic works, and the interior development, the progress of the great Scholastic's doctrine, must not be overlooked; finally, one should have a clear knowledge of the origin, method, and characteristics of each work. In this matter I refer the reader to what has been said above, particularly on the relation existing between the *Quaestions disputatae* and the *Summa Theologica.*

It should be noted that the canon of interpretation, "*Divus Thomas sui interpres,*" was applied long before Massoulié formulated it. John Capreolus adduced and appraised passages from all the works of St. Thomas in support of the *conclusiones* in which he enunciated points of Thomistic doctrine. This idea also gave rise to the *Tabula aurea* of Peter of Bergamo. Eminent Thomists of our time have strongly emphasized that St. Thomas should be explained by means of parallel passages from his various works, before we have recourse to the commentators. Cardinal Zigliara, O.P.,[2] writes: "In my judgment, the true method for deriving profit from Thomistic doctrines and for penetrat-

[2] *Sopra alcune interpretazioni della dottrina ideologica di S. Tommaso d'Aquino* (2nd ed., Viterbo, 1870), p. 38; quoted by E. Commer in *Divus Thomas* 5 (1918), p. 289.

ing them to the very bottom, is to explain St. Thomas by St. Thomas, by first bringing together all his principles with the utmost accuracy, and in their light pondering and comparing the doctrines scattered in his numerous works. By saying this, however, I do not mean to exclude the study of the commentators, for it is often necessary to resort to them, especially to the more learned, and not to deviate arbitrarily from their interpretations; but they should not be made the main object of study. St. Thomas first! With his help one always learns to estimate the value of his commentators, whereas from them one does not always nor in everything learn to know St. Thomas." Coconnier, O.P.,[3] expresses the same thought when he writes: "In the works of St. Thomas the light is everywhere intense and radiant; to neglect him for the commentators would be to leave the sunlight for the light of candles."

The third step in the systematic method of interpretation is the study of the commentaries on the *Summa*, with the principal types of which we have become acquainted in the foregoing historical survey. Unquestionably they are very stimulating and helpful for understanding the letter and spirit of the theological *Summa*.

[3] *"Le vrai Thomiste,"* in *Revue Thomiste*, I (1893), p. 10.

The second method of the interpretation of St. Thomas, and particularly of the *Summa Theologica*, is the *historical method*. To be fruitful, it must be based on the systematic method; for it presupposes a thorough familiarity with the phraseology, method, and train of thought of St. Thomas. While the systematic method of interpretation looks upon the writings and doctrines of the great Doctor as a finished whole and seeks to fathom Thomistic teaching in its *being*, the historical method turns its attention chiefly to the texts and ideas of St. Thomas in their *becoming*. Here the Thomistic writings are considered and appraised according to their living connection with the whole of Scholasticism, until they finally appear in sharp outlines against the background of the Christian culture of the Middle Ages. There is no doubt that, in the light of such an investigation, the scientific work of St. Thomas commands a high degree of historical interest and that the *Summa Theologica*, as the imposing codification of the great philosophical and theological ideas which dominated the cultural life of the Middle Ages in the widest sense of the word,[4] exercises a special charm and produces a deep impression on the modern observer, even though he be not meta-

[4] Cfr. M. De Wulf, *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages* (Princeton and London, 1922); also, Bede Jarrett, O.P., *Social Theories of the Middle Ages* (Boston, 1926). (Tr.)

physically or theologically minded. This has been amply attested by the declarations of modern thinkers.

But this historico-genetic study is very profitable also for widening and deepening our knowledge of the thought itself of St. Thomas. Above all, it helps us to plunge into the rich intellectual life of Aquinas, so alert to all the impulses and so open to all the currents of his age, and to assist at the birth and growth of his philosophical and theological ideas. In particular, we get a full and vivid idea of the perfection of the theological *Summa*, both in matter and manner, when with fidelity to the sources we carefully consider, both in the aggregate and in detail, its true place in the *ensemble* of Scholasticism. Finally, this historical inquiry enables us to understand the influence the Thomistic writings and doctrines exerted on their epoch, and to see the rise and subsequent approval of the great Scholastic's personal doctrines which contrasted with the *doctrina communis* of the times and opened many new ways. And it is precisely from this point of view that the historical investigation throws abundant light on the theological *Summa*.

The historical method of interpretation studies the works of St. Thomas in regard to the past, the

present, and the future; that is to say, it considers the relation of his writings—in our case, of the *Summa Theologica*—to their sources, models, and precursors; it traces their connections with contemporaneous Scholastic works; finally, it investigates the influence St. Thomas exercised on the times immediately following his own. Here we can make only some brief remarks on each of these three points.

The relation of St. Thomas to his sources, his models, and his distant, near, and immediate predecessors, can be considered either from the standpoint of method or from that of doctrinal content. From the methodical point of view we must investigate how St. Thomas utilized his sources, whether and to what extent, for example, he drew his citations of the Church Fathers from the originals or translations, and in what measure he took them over from *florilegia*, glosses, or the writings of other Scholastics. It will have to be examined whether he appraises such passages according to their context or whether he isolates them and utilizes them according to their own value. The work of G. v. Hertling on *Citations from St. Augustine in St. Thomas Aquinas* is a splendid proof that such investigations on the manner of utilizing sources can

be of great service in disclosing the doctrinal relations of St. Thomas to the Fathers, philosophers, and earlier Schoolmen. In this connection it will also have to be established whether in his utilization of sources St. Thomas gives evidence of a sense of historical criticism and whether he occupies himself successfully with questions of authenticity; thus it will still be possible to enrich the conclusions heretofore reached by those who have studied these questions.

In order to measure the influence exerted on St. Thomas by his sources, models, and predecessors, it would first have to be ascertained of what authors he actually availed himself. Considerable information is available on this point, but we are still unable to form an exhaustive judgment. A good start has been made in a series of articles written by P. Gardeil, O.P., and published in the *Revue Thomiste*.[5] It is comparatively easy to identify the citations from the Fathers, Aristotle, the Arabian-Jewish philosophers, the early Scholastics, canonical literature, and especially Sacred Scripture, for here, as a rule, St. Thomas indicates the authors by name.

[5] *"La réforme de la théologie catholique. Les procédés exégétiques de Saint Thomas,"* in *Revue Thomiste,* XI (1903), pp. 428–457. *Idem, "La documentation de Saint Thomas," ibid.,* pp. 197–215. Cfr. the very valuable article by M. Riquet, *"Saint Thomas d'Aquin et les 'Auctoritates' en philosophie,"* in *Archives de Philosophie,* III (1925), pp. 177–255.

Note, however, that the printed editions must be utilized with some caution, for many citations have been subsequently amplified.

The investigation of the doctrinal influence exerted on the writings of St. Thomas by the sources mentioned has been promoted by some valuable monographs, particularly on the relation of Thomistic doctrines to Aristotle, St. Augustine, Neo-Platonism, Averroes, Avicenna, Avencebrol, and Moses Maimonides. It stands to reason that the study of the commentaries of St. Thomas on Aristotle and a thorough acquaintance with works on the problem of the reception of Aristotle in the Middle Ages, are of great importance for discerning the Aristotelian elements in the *Summa Theologica*. The relations of St. Thomas to the Greek Fathers have as yet received but little attention, with the exception of St. John Damascene and the Pseudo-Areopagite.[6] So, too, the relation of

[6] M. Duffò, *S. Jean Damascène, source de S. Thomas d'Aquin,* in *Bulletin de la littérature ecclésiastique,* 1906, pp. 126–130; J. Durantel, *S. Thomas et le Pseudo-Denis* (Paris, 1919); A. Feder, S.J., *"Des Aquinaten Kommentar zu Pseudo-Dionysius' 'De divinis nominibus,'"* in *Scholastik,* I (1926), pp. 321–351; J. Bardy, *"Notes sur les sources patristiques grecques de S. Thomas dans la Ire partie de la Somme théologique,"* in *Revue des sciences philos. et théol.,* 12 (1923), pp. 493–502. An extensive exposition of the relations of St. Thomas to the Greek Fathers will be given in the forthcoming work of J. Bakes, *Die Christologie des hl. Thomas von Aquin in ihrer Beziehung zur griechischen Patristik.*

Aquinas to the Latin Fathers, of whom not only Augustine, but also Gregory the Great and Isidore of Seville influenced him, has not yet been fully investigated. It must likewise be admitted that, despite all the researches, the connections between the theory of knowledge of St. Thomas and that of St. Augustine are not yet sufficiently clear.[7] The great advances of specialized research made in the field of twelfth-century Scholasticism can also enlighten us on the relations of St. Thomas to the great theologians of early Scholasticism. The genetic exposition of the Thomistic proofs for the existence of God, found in Baeumker's *Witelo*, shows how much light historical research can shed on individual points of the doctrine of St. Thomas. In this connection I also wish to point out as an excellent example of the study one can make of entire treatises of the theological *Summa* by tracing them to their sources, M. Meier's work, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin "De passionibus animae."* [8]

The investigation of the sources employed by St. Thomas becomes more difficult, the nearer we come

[7] Cfr., for example, M. Grabmann, *Der göttliche Grund menschlicher Wahrheitserkenntnis nach Augustinus und Thomas von Aquin* (Münster, 1924); E. Gilson, *"Pourquoi S. Thomas a critiqué S. Augustin,"* in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen age,* I (1926–1927), pp. 5–127.

[8] In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,* XI (Münster, 1917), No. 2.

to his time. While Albert the Great often names the authors of the close of the twelfth and those of the thirteenth century, for example Simon of Tournai, St. Thomas, as a rule, employs the anonymous term *quidam*. Once he mentions Alanus de Insulis; the names of Praepositinus and William of Auxerre occur repeatedly. The study of the unpublished *Summae*, commentaries on the *Sentences*, and *Quaestiones* of the thirteenth and of the beginning of the fourteenth century will in many instances probably help to lift the veil that covers those *quidam's* and make known the representatives of the theories of which some are approved while others are rejected wholly or in part by St. Thomas. To form a clear idea of the relation of St. Thomas especially to the authors of the thirteenth century, it would be necessary to know the contents of the library which he had at his disposal. Unfortunately we are not as lucky in his case as we are in that of his colleague and literary opponent, Gerard of Abbeville, from whose bequests to the Sorbonne we know what books he possessed.

To understand the historical background of the ideas embodied in the theological *Summa*, and of the works of St. Thomas Aquinas in general, it is of paramount importance to have a knowledge of the unpublished *Summae* and commentaries on

the *Sentences* written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—those of Robert of Melun, Robert of Courçon, Peter Cantor, Martin of Cremona, Praepositinus, Peter of Capua, Roland of Cremona, Philip of Grève, Godfrey of Poitiers, etc.; also of the unpublished *Commentaries on the Sentences* of Hugh of St. Cher, Odo Rigaldus, Richard Fishacre, Robert Kilwardby, Bombolognus, etc. By thus studying the doctrines of St. Thomas in the historical setting of the preceding development of ideas, we can more readily realize what he intended and achieved.

With the vision of a genius the great Denifle recognized the important bearing of such researches; it was precisely on the basis of his knowledge of the earlier *Summae* that he planned to write a historical commentary on the *Summa Theologica.* O. Lottin, O.S.B., the highest current authority on Thomistic ethics, has most impressively drawn the historical background of the teaching of St. Thomas on *synderesis,* natural law, and kindred subjects. What an abundance of light is shed on the articles of the theological *Summa* that deal with the scientific character of theology, the act of faith, and so on, by the researches of M. D. Chenu, O. P., in the unpublished *Summae* and commentaries on the *Sentences!* In like manner A. Landgraf makes

the achievement of St. Thomas in the doctrine on sin stand out sharply against the background of historical development.[9]

But it is not only the unpublished theological works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that furnish valuable material for a historical commentary on the *Summa Theologica;* the same holds true also of the literary productions coming from the faculty of arts, especially the unpublished commentaries on Aristotle—I need refer only to those of Peter of Ireland, the teacher of St. Thomas in his youth. The characteristic qualities of Christian-Thomistic Aristotelianism are best seen in contrast with Averroistic Aristotelianism. Not a few passages in the works of St. Thomas, including

[9] O. Lottin, O.S.B., *Les éléments de la moralité des actes chez S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain, 1923); *Le droit naturel chez saint Thomas et ses prédécesseurs: Commentaire historique de la Iª IIæ, q. 94* (Louvain, 1926); *"Les premiers linéaments du traité de la synderèse au moyen age,"* in *Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie,* 28 (1926), pp. 426 sqq.; *"Le créateur du traité de la synderèse," ibid.,* 29 (1927), pp. 197 sqq.; *"La synderèse chez les premiers maîtres franciscains de Paris," ibid.,* 29 (1927), pp. 265 sqq.; *"La synderèse chez Albert le Grand et S. Thomas d'Aquin," ibid.,* 30 (1928), pp. 18 sqq.—M. D. Chenu, O.P., *Contribution à l'histoire du traité de la loi. Commentaire historique de IIª IIæ, q. I, art. 2,* in *Mélanges Thomistes,* Le Saulchoir, 1923, pp. 123–140; *Pro fidei supernaturalitate illustranda,* in *Xenia thomistica,* III (Rome, 1925), pp. 297–307; *"La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle,"* in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen age,* 2 (1927), pp. 31–71.—A. Landgraf, *Das Wesen der lässlichen Sünde in der Scholastik bis Thomas von Aquin* (1923).

the theological *Summa*, became intelligible only when Mandonnet disclosed the powerful intellectual movement of Latin Averroism at the University of Paris under the leadership of Siger of Brabant.[10] Interesting similarities as well as contrasts with the psychological questions in the *Prima* will be furnished by the publication of the work *De anima* of Peter of Spain, later Pope John XXI, which is probably the most extensive systematic treatise on psychology produced during the golden age of Scholasticism.[11]

However, not only the relations of St. Thomas to the unpublished authors are still awaiting special research, but also his connections with the great Scholastics of the thirteenth century whose works have been published. I need mention only Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great. As to Alexander of Hales, Ign. Jeiler, O.F.M.,[12] and P. Parthenius

[10] P. Mandonnet, O.P., *Siger de Brabant et L'Averroisme Latin au XIII^me Siècle* (2nd ed., Louvain, 1911). (Tr.)

[11] M. Grabmann, *Ein ungedrucktes Lehrbuch der Psychologie des Petrus Hispanus (Papst Johannes XXI, + 1277) im Cod. 3314 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris;* H. Finke, *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft,* Vol. I: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* First Series (Münster, 1928), pp. 166–173.

[12] *Die sogenannte Summa de virtutibus des Alexander von Hales,* in *Katholik,* 1879, I, p. 53; "It seems to us that it would not redound to the honor of St. Thomas to maintain that when writing his incomparable *Summa,* he did not utilize the great *Summa* of Alexander of Hales, so warmly recommended by

Minges, O.F.M.,[13] have given us some valuable indications. In regard to Albert the Great, already the contemporaries of St. Thomas were of the opinion that he owed much to his famous German teacher. In John Lector of Freiburg [14] we find the sentence: "*Et quasi eadem verba sunt Thomae et Alberti, quia Thomas sumpsit de Alberto, qui doctor eius fuit in studio Coloniensi.*" Denifle [15] characterizes the relation between Albert and Thomas as follows: "For Thomas, Albert the Great was the Elias to whose mantle he continually clung. Without Albert, Thomas would not have become what he actually is, the prince and king of theologians. Albert prepared him for this. Bramante's mighty pil-

the Pope. He, the humblest of men, who assures us that he wrote his *Summa* only for beginners and who always preferred the knowledge of others to his own whenever truth permitted, surely was ready to turn to account in his own way whatever he found to be good in the other masters of Scholasticism! It is, then, no attack on the reputation of the Angelic Doctor to believe that one has found in the first of all theological works, the *Summa* of St. Thomas, distinct traces of the *Summa* of Alexander of Hales."

[13] "*Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zwischen der Summa Alexanders von Hales und dem hl. Thomas,*" in *Franziskanische Studien,* 3 (1916).

[14] *Summa Confessorum,* l. III, *tit. de consecratione,* q. 17.

[15] In a sermon preached in Rome. See the pamphlet, *Albertusfeier in Rom. Mit den Predigten Sr. Eminenz des Kardinals Hergenröther und des P. Denifle, O.P.* (Munich, 1880), p. 22. On the relations between Albert and Thomas, see also Mandonnet's article, "*Frères prêcheurs* (*La théologie dans l'ordre des frères prêcheurs*)," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* Vol. VI, pp. 870 sq.

lars support Michelangelo's cupola of St. Peter's; Albert's oral teaching and written works laid the foundations for the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas."

The investigation of the sources to determine the scientific relation between the works of the two great Scholastics is a task yet to be accomplished in detail. R. de Liechtys [16] confines himself to generalities. For the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, Albert's commentaries on the *Sentences* and his *Summa de creaturis* are the chief writings to be considered. The unpublished parts of the latter work, which were recently discovered, extend our knowledge of Albert's theology and so become valuable for appraising the corresponding teaching of St. Thomas. Inasmuch as Albert's theological *Summa* was written after that of St. Thomas, it cannot be regarded as a source of the latter. On the contrary, Albert's *Quaestiones* on the *Nicomachaean Ethics*, discovered in three copies by A. Pelzer,[17] are all the more important for determining the connection between Albert and Thomas because they represent the lectures of his teacher in Cologne, as collected

[16] *Albert le Grand et S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1860).

[17] A. Pelzer, "Le cours inédit d'Albert le Grand sur la Morale à Nicomaque rédigé par saint Thomas d'Aquin," in *Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie*, 24 (1922), pp. 353–361, 479–520.

and edited by Aquinas. In *Cod. Vat. lat.* 722 they bear the title: "*Questiones fratris Alberti, quas collegit magister frater Thomas de Aquino.*"

The extensive unpublished commentary of Albert on the work, *De divinis nominibus*, the publication of which is being prepared by P. G. Théry, O.P., must be taken into account in investigating the influence of Albert on his pupil, for at Cologne St. Thomas attended lectures on this work of the Pseudo-Areopagite. However, the famous manuscript of Albert's commentary on the works of Dionysius, found in the *Biblioteca Nazionale* of Naples, is no autograph of Aquinas. Albert did not influence St. Thomas as strongly as he did Ulric of Strasburg,[18] in whom Albert's Neo-Platonism is most clearly reflected. What is more, there are doctrinal contrarieties between Thomas and Albert which came to the fore in a somewhat exaggerated form at the end of the Middle Ages, during the well known controversy between the Thomists and the Albertists at the University of Cologne.[19]

We have now come to the period during which St. Thomas himself taught and wrote. The historical

[18] A. Stohr, *Die Trinitätslehre Ulrichs von Strassburg mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zu Albert d. Gr. und Thomas von Aquin* (Münster, 1928).

[19] Cfr. M. Grabmann, "*Der Einfluss Alberts d. Gr. auf das mittelalterliche Geistesleben*," in *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 52 (1928), pp. 153–182, 813–836.

method of interpretation considers the relation of the theological *Summa* and other works of St. Thomas to those of contemporary Scholastics, even when no dependence can be discovered between them. It is enough to confront the doctrine of St. Thomas with the Scholasticism of his time in order to see it stand out in stronger relief. What an abundance of light has been thrown on the theology of St. Bonaventure, not only from the historical, but also from the doctrinal standpoint, by the scholia in which P. Jeiler compares the Seraphic Doctor's commentary on the *Sentences* with the teachings of other Scholastics! As a whole, these scholia are perhaps the most significant Scholastic work of our time bearing on dogma and the history of dogma. The same results will be obtained by studying the doctrine of St. Thomas in the light of the theological speculations of his time. As yet, much less has been done in this respect for dogma and the history of dogma than for the history of philosophy. In regard to the latter, the investigation of the problem of the strife between Augustinianism and Aristotelianism, first undertaken by Cardinal Ehrle, has materially furthered our historical knowledge of Thomistic doctrines.

A word more on the relation of St. Thomas to the Scholasticism that immediately followed, on the

influence of his ideas on the next generation. We may designate it, in the words of Cardinal Ehrle,[20] as "the conflict about the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas during the first fifty years after his death." This is above all the era of the earliest disciples of St. Thomas, of his immediate disciples and their pupils, who clung to their great teacher with glowing enthusiasm and touching loyalty and with as much courage as adroitness defended the doctrine of Aquinas which was now being violently attacked at all points. It is quite obvious that the works coming from this earliest Thomistic school, which for the most part still remain unpublished, are of paramount importance for the understanding of the master's doctrine by the very fact that their authors were in close touch with the life and personality of Aquinas and are witnesses of a living tradition. In particular, they cast a clear light on the personal views of St. Thomas and on disputed points of his teaching; thus in many instances every shadow of doubt as to the true sense of the *doctrina S. Thomae* is dissipated.

The interpretation of the theological *Summa* will be greatly aided by a thorough study of the various *Correctoria Corruptorii*, that is, of the replies to

[20] *"Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten fünfzig Jahren nach seinem Tode,"* in *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 37 (1913), pp. 266–318.

the attacks of the Franciscan, William de la Mare; for these attacks are directed chiefly against articles of the *Summa*. What Richard Clapwell, John Quidort of Paris, Ramberto dei Primadizzi, and other authors of such defences tell us about each article, often with an abundance of detail, is pre-eminently a work of commentators in the best sense of the word. It is a welcome fact that the *Bibliothèque Thomiste*, conducted by P. Mandonnet, has included the publication of these *Correctoria* in the far-reaching plan of its undertakings. May the interpreters of the theological *Summa* and the exponents of the doctrine of St. Thomas draw copiously from these sources!

A most valuable source for the understanding of the philosophical and theological doctrines of St. Thomas is the historical study of the criticism directed against them by his contemporaries and by the thinkers who came immediately after him, and of the defences written by his earliest followers. The unpublished writings in which Bernard of Clermont, Robert of Tortocollo, Herveus Natalis, Thomas of Sutton, and others have defended and explained the teaching of Aquinas against the attacks of Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines, Duns Scotus, Robert Cowton, Durandus, Aureolus, etc., bear the impress of genuine expositions of the

doctrina S. Thomae by reason of their proximity to him in time and of the living tradition to which they testify. The published *Liber propugnatorius super primum Sententiarum contra Iohannem Scotum* of Thomas of Sutton is a more trustworthy guide for determining the true relation between the two great Scholastics than the much later polemical writings of theologians who frequently utilized works mistakenly attributed to Scotus.[21] The rich results obtainable from the study of the works of Durandus for the historical and doctrinal understanding of Thomistic teaching are exemplified with surprising abundance in J. Koch's splendid monograph on Durandus, which enables us to witness the conflict raging round the doctrine of St. Thomas, and strikes the water of living reality and understanding from the arid rocks of these Scholastic manuscripts, so difficult to read and so hard to comprehend.

We may further point out that the metaphysical and epistemological portions of the *Summa Theologica* are fully and reliably elucidated by the commentaries on the *Sentences*, the *Quaestiones*,

[21] More specific information on this point will be furnished in an extensive work of M. Schmaus, entitled, *Die Lehrverschiedenheiten zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Skotus in der Trinitätslehre nach dem Liber propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus.*

Quodlibeta, and *Opuscula* of the first followers of St. Thomas. I refer here only to the *Quodlibeta* of John of Naples, now available in their whole ample content through the fortunate discoveries of P. J. March; they are very valuable because, besides Herveus Natalis, John of Naples was the leading Thomist of the fourteenth century. The views of St. Thomas on the oneness of the substantial form in man are presented and explained in their full meaning, consequences, and difficulties by the *Opuscula*, the monographs *De unitate formae* of Aegidius of Rome, Aegidius of Lessines, Thomas of Sutton, Herveus Natalis, John of Faenza. Master Eckhart also wrote a *Quaestio* on this topic.[22] Of the commentaries on the *Sentences* I call special attention to the *Thomasinus*, that is, the commentary of the Dominican Cardinal Guilelmus Petri de Godino,[23] which contains a clear and pregnant exposition of Thomistic doctrine. Finally, I wish to emphasize the fact that the supreme importance of John Capreolus, the *Princeps Thomistarum*, is

[22] M. Grabmann, *Neuaufgefundene Pariser Quaestionen Meister Eckharts und ihre Stellung in seinem geistigen Entwicklungsgange*, in *Abhandlungen der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Bd. XXXII, 7. Abhandlung (Munich, 1927), p. 90 sqq.

[23] M. Grabmann, *"Kardinal Guilelmus Petri de Godino + 1336) und seine Lectura Thomasina,"* in *Divus Thomas*, 4 (1926), pp. 385–403.

founded not only on his eminent speculative talent by means of which he penetrated so deeply into the ideas of St. Thomas, but also on his exceptionally intelligent utilization and appraisal of the criticisms directed against the doctrine of Aquinas by Scotus, Peter Aureoli, Durandus, William of Ockham, and Gregory of Rimini. The polemical sections of his monumental apologetic work contain very valuable material for the historical interpretation of St. Thomas.

II. UTILIZATION OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA*

We wish to add some brief remarks on the utilization and present value of the *Summa Theologica*. To do this properly, we must first indicate the significance of this monument of Scholasticism for the Catholic theology of to-day. Even for our times the *Summa* is, and will continue to be, by reason of its content and method, the best systematic exposition of all speculative theology, dogmatic as well as moral.

There is no contradiction in the fact that the same Pope who prompted the new codification of Canon Law also emphatically recommended the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, a work of the Middle

Ages, as a manual and text-book for higher theological studies.[24] The substantial identity of Catholic teaching, dogmatic and moral, throughout the ages, the ever new and inexhaustible vitality of the Aristotelian philosophy, which coöperated so powerfully in the construction of the *Summa*, and the peerless qualities of method in this principal work of St. Thomas, which we have fully described above, lend to this "classical manual *par excellence*," as Scheeben [25] calls it, an imperishable value in Catholic theology. And to-day above all, when biblical and historical theology are in such a flourishing condition, speculative theology can in its turn gather strength and rise to greater heights by seeking light and inspiration in the *Summa Theologica.*

A passing and superficial acquaintance with the *Summa* of St. Thomas might give the impression

[24] Pius X, *Motu Proprio pro Italia et Insulis adiacentibus de studio doctrinae S. Thomae Aquinatis in scholis catholicis promovendo, Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* VI (1914), p. 336.—Cfr. A. Horváth, O.P., *"Die Summa Theologica des hl. Thomas von Aquin als Textbuch,"* in *Divus Thomas,* 2 (1915), pp. 173–195. Pius XI, *Litterae encyclicae saeculo sexto exeunte a sanctorum caelitum honoribus Thomae Aquinati decretis, "Studiorum ducem," Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XV (1923), pp. 309–328. L. Lavaud, *Saint Thomas "guide des études." Notes et Commentaires sur l'Encyclique "Studiorum ducem" de S. S. Pie* XI (Paris, 1925). S. Szabò, O.P., *Die Auktorität des hl. Thomas von Aquin in der Theologie* (Ratisbon, 1919).

[25] *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik,* Vol. I, p. 434.

that this work is a mixture of philosophy and theology, that it assigns the first place to the proofs from reason, that it is more Aristotelian than Christian. Such, however, is not the case. In a profound dissertation P. Garrigou-Lagrange [26] has set forth the supernatural spirit of the theology of St. Thomas, particularly as it appears in the *Summa*. With incomparable lucidity Aquinas has drawn the line of demarcation between the natural and the supernatural order, and could therefore bring out all the more clearly the sublimity and uniqueness of the supernatural. Precisely because he worked out so sharply the distinction between nature and grace, he was able to establish so clearly the harmony between the two orders. In his *Summa Theologica* we have a most intimate union of the profound insight of the Fathers, especially of St. Augustine, into the connections and laws, the supernatural *rationes*, the mysteries of Christianity, with the intellectual energy of Aristotelian metaphysics illuminating the deepest foundations of being, the innermost natural *rationes* of all mundane reality.

The theology of St. Thomas was the unfailing source of inspiration for the theological speculation of the following centuries; time and again it

[26] *De spiritu supernaturali theologiae Divi Thomae*, in *Miscellanea Dominicana* (Rome, 1923), pp. 141–150.

quickened and strengthened the sense of the supernatural. M. J. Scheeben, the most profound speculative theologian of the nineteenth century, acquired his deep insight into the mysteries of Christianity chiefly from a profound study of St. Thomas. The speculative theology of Aquinas is inseparable from the great tradition of patristic theology. It is quite in accord with the breadth and depth of the Angelic Doctor's theology when the speculative theology of our day welcomes and assimilates the Christian ideas of the patristic period which, through recent historical research, are known to us in a far larger measure than they were to the Middle Ages.

In the course of past centuries the *Summa Theologica* was pressed into the service of the Christian life and turned to practical account for purposes of spiritual guidance and preaching. In four French manuscripts, to which I can add an anonymous codex of Munich, there is preserved a voluminous treatise *De officio sacerdotis*, the work of a pupil of St. Thomas, the Dominican Albert of Brescia, who was styled the "*specialis imitator doctrinae Fratris Thomae.*" Albert makes an extensive selection, "*ex verbis et quaestionibus et tractatibus Fr. Thomae de Aquino,*" especially from the second and third part of the *Summa*, of all that a priest

and spiritual director should know about the virtues and the Sacraments. Later on the Dominicans L. Bancel [27] and J. B. Perrazzo,[28] and others, prepared practical excerpts from the theological *Summa* for the use of confessors and preachers. Naturally, I can here give only very general indications, for all centuries have contributed numerous examples of this practical utilization of the *Summa*. The great pulpit orators drew inspiration from this work—Bossuet, for instance, and in more recent times, the Dominicans Monsabré [29] and Janvier,[30] of whom the former expounded the dogmatic and the latter the moral teaching of the *Summa*.

Ascetical and mystical literature also received valuable inspirations from the *Summa theologica*. When treating of this phase of the influence of the *Summa*, I cited some older works. Of the more recent expositions of the doctrine on Christian perfection according to St. Thomas, I may mention those of V. Maumus, O.P., Meynard, O.P., Barthier, H. Pope, O.P., and Grundkötter.[31] That the

[27] *Moralis D. Thomae doctoris angelici etc.* (Avignon, 1677).

[28] *Thomisticus Ecclesiastes,* Vols. I–III (Ferrara, 1692; Venice, 1700 f.).

[29] *Exposition du dogme catholique* (Paris, 1873–1890).

[30] *Exposition de la morale catholique* (Paris, 1913 sqq.).

[31] V. Maumus, O.P., *La doctrine spirituelle de St. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1885); Meynard, O.P., *Traité de la vie in-*

Summa Theologica can furnish the best materials for outlining the ideal of the priesthood is shown by H. Mahieu's beautiful book, *Probatio charitatis.* Those who show such a lively interest in Christian mysticism and in a deeper interior life to-day, can find in the doctrine of the *Secunda Secundae* on the contemplative life the principles that will guard them against error and guide them along safe paths. The Spanish Dominican Th. de Vallgornera (d. 1665) wrote his voluminous work, *Mystica Theologia D. Thomae utriusque theologiae principis,* chiefly with the help of the *Summa Theologica.* Philip of the Most Holy Trinity, who composed one of the best expositions of the whole doctrine on mysticism, is at the same time the author of an excellent *Summa philosophiae,* one of the most lucid manuals of Thomistic philosophy and a solid commentary on the theological *Summa.*

Recently P. Garrigou-Lagrange [32] has empha-

térieure: Théologie ascétique et mystique (3rd ed., Paris, 1924); Barthier, *De la perfection chrétienne et de la perfection religieuse d'après St. Thomas d'Aquin et St. François de Sales* (Paris, 1902); H. Pope, O.P., *St. Thomas Aquinas on Contemplative Prayer* (London, 1914); B. Grundkötter, *Anleitung zur christlichen Vollkommenheit, insbesondere nach der Lehre des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Thomas von Aquin* (3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1891).

[32] *Perfection chrétienne et Contemplation selon S. Thomas d'Aquin et S. Jean de la Croix,* Saint-Maximin, 1923. The literature on Thomistic doctrines is given in full in that excellent periodical, *Bulletin Thomiste.*

sized the fundamental importance of the theology of St. Thomas for the theory and practice of Catholic mysticism, and shown how the Angelic Doctor's profound conception of the supernatural character of faith and of the life of grace constitutes the sure dogmatic groundwork of mystical theology. With this dogmatic and metaphysical orientation of mysticism the psychological method may be readily combined. There are also other theologians of to-day, like the Dominicans A. Gardeil, J. Joret, J. G. Arintero, Bishop Waffelaert of Bruges, the dogmatician Tanquerey—to mention only a few—who derive their theory of mysticism from the *Summa Theologica* and other works of St. Thomas. The magazine *La Vie Spirituelle* is the centre of this great Thomistic current of modern Catholic mysticism.

The utilization of the *Summa Theologica* is not confined to the theoretical and practical domains of Catholic theology; it extends beyond the theological pale and comes in touch with the great questions and problems, especially philosophical, that are agitating *modern thought and life*. We can indicate only a few examples and proofs of this. The questions of the *Prima* (q. 12 and 13) which establish the modes and limits of our knowledge of God, contain, in conjunction with parallel passages

in other works of St. Thomas (*De potentia*, q. 7; *Summa contra Gentiles*, I, 30 sqq.), valuable points of view and trains of thought which are useful in refuting modern agnosticism.[33] For St. Thomas himself made a thorough study of the agnosticism of Moses Maimonides. If one looks for modern traits in Scholastic thought and for Scholastic traits in modern thought, one will discover in the psychology of the *Prima* (q. 75–89) certain passages that point to the modern way of stating problems of psychology and epistemology.[34]

Despite the metaphysical bent of his psychology, St. Thomas by no means undervalued the rôle of experience. On closer examination one finds that he has made many and various contributions to the introspective analysis of the life of the soul.[35] The phrases *in seipso experiri, experimento patet, magis experimur*, etc., occur frequently in his writings.

[33] Cfr. the article *"Agnosticisme"* by Chossat, S.J., in Adhémar d' Alès, *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique*, Vol. I, p. 1 sqq.

[34] On what follows, see M. Grabmann, *Der Gegenwartswert der geschichtlichen Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Philosophie* (Vienna, 1913), p. 58 sqq.; *Idem, Der kritische Realismus Oswald Külpes und der Standpunkt der aristotelisch-scholastischen Philosophie*, in *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*, 29 (1916), pp. 333–369.—Also, the articles by Grabmann and other Neo-Scholastics in Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism* (2nd. ed. St. Louis, 1927). (Tr.)

[35] This is admitted by some non-Scholastics; cfr. Zybura, *op. cit.*, pp. 17, 69, 75. (Tr.)

He holds that a deeper knowledge of the nature of the soul rests on a "*diligens et subtilis inquisitio*" of psychological phenomena (I^a, q. 87, art. 1). The significance of the imagination in the higher life of the soul is established by appealing to facts of experience (q. 84, art. 7). Divers points of contact have been found between the Thomistic psychology of knowledge, the most lucid exposition of which is given in the *Prima*, and the results of modern experimental psychology of the school of O. Külpe (K. Bühler, etc.).[36] With a thorough knowledge of both domains, F. Aveling of London has made a searching study of these relations and resemblances.[37]

As regards the theory of knowledge, the first part of the *Summa Theologica* (q. 85, art. 2) contains some excellent arguments for the refutation of idealism and subjectivism in all their forms. We may also point out that in his theological *Summa* as well as in his other works St. Thomas here and there offers some very significant reflections on the ontological and transcendental validity of the first

[36] Cfr. C. Gutberlet, *Experimentelle Psychologie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Pädagogik* (Paderborn, 1913), pp. 72–97.

[37] "*Confirmations expérimentales d'une théorie du processus cognitif*," in *Annales de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie*, 2 (Louvain, 1913).—*Idem, On the Consciousness of the Universal and the Individual* (London, 1912). (Tr.)

principles on which he founds his discussions.[38] There are also some points of resemblance between this psychological section of the *Prima* and the critical realism of our day. I cannot enter into details on this subject, the more so as other works of Aquinas would have to be considered, for example, the *Quaestiones disputatae De veritate, De anima, De creaturis spiritualibus*, etc. The importance of the Thomistic theory of knowledge for our times is being brought out especially by Noel, Balthasar, Kremer, and other representatives of the Louvain school of Cardinal Mercier. Searching investigations, some of them quite voluminous, have also been devoted to this question by E. Gilson, J. Maritain, P. Roland-Gosselin, O.P., P. J. Maréchal, S.J., P. Descoqs, S.J., and others. The points of contact between Thomistic epistemology and psychology on the one hand, and modern philosophical thought on the other, are also being traced by A. Gemelli, G. Zamboni, and other collaborators of the *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, and by the recently founded American periodical, *The New Scholasticism*. In Germany the works of J. Geyser shed an abundance of light upon the psychology and theory of knowledge of Aquinas.

[38] On this point see the basic work of R. P. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *Dieu, son existence et sa nature* (4th ed., Paris, 1923).

The examination of modern traits in Thomistic philosophy and of Scholastic elements in modern philosophic thought must take its orientation from the historical insight into the genesis of the teachings of St. Thomas. Philosophical doctrines which at first blush appear very similar, prove to be quite different when we consider the difference in the nature of the historical soil out of which they grew. Finally, it is to be noted that in all parts of the *Summa Theologica* we come upon explanations with a terminological and linguistic content which invite comparison with modern linguistics and semantics.[39]

Most of the points of contact of Thomism with the great questions of our day come from the *Secunda*, where, combining the penetrating intuition of St. Augustine with the realism of Aristotle, St. Thomas outlines a general synthesis of Christian morality together with its natural and supernatural, individual and sociological characteristics and applications. We have already called attention to the importance of this most extensive part of the *Summa*, which the contemporaries of St. Thomas noted and appreciated; hence, can here confine ourselves to some brief remarks. It is pre-

[39] Cfr. M. Heidegger, *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus* (Tübingen, 1915); M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, pp. 141 sqq.

cisely in his treatise on morals that Aquinas has made and utilized an abundance of observations. "His ethics," writes J. Mausbach,[40] "contains . . . a psychological doctrine and a conception of human nature which harmonize admirably with the results of modern anthropology, more so, in fact, than many later systems of philosophy." By detailed investigations S. Deploige [41] has convincingly shown that in ethical, sociological, and kindred problems St. Thomas masterfully applied methods of observation which are usually looked upon as the achievements of modern science. The ethics, politics, and sociology of Aquinas, appropriately combining analysis and synthesis, are grounded on ideas, principles, and standards which, being drawn from human nature itself as revealed by experience, and being ultimately anchored in God, impart unity, solidity, and depth to these doctrines and give them an imperishable worth. To-day, in particular, when serious thinkers are again concerning themselves with absolute values and universal standards of value, and when the disintegration of cultural, social, and political life threatens with growing ruthlessness to become com-

[40] *Grundlage und Ausbildung des Charakters nach dem hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Freiburg, 1911), p. 4.

[41] *Le Conflit de la Morale et de la Sociologie* (3rd ed., Paris, 1923).

plete, the *Secunda* of St. Thomas can furnish solid materials for reconstruction, because it is the most profound scientific exposition of the moral teaching of Christianity.

In conclusion, we may briefly point out some "modern traits" in the *Secunda*. The theory and analysis of the human will in the beginning of the *Prima Secundae* (q. 6–17) presents surprising analogies with the results of the experimental investigations conducted by A. Michotte and Narcissus Ach.[42] The treatise on the passions (q. 22–48) contains an abundance of shrewd psychological observations on the sentiments and emotions, and can well claim the interest of the modern psychologist. The deep and difficult theory of the *habitus*, which immediately follows this section (q. 49 sqq.), likewise deserves the attention of the psychologists and educators of to-day. The detailed and searching exposition of supernatural religious acts and habits, which fills a large portion of the *Prima Secundae*, can give valuable orientation to the psychology of religion which is being developed in our day; likewise, the treatise on faith, at the beginning of the *Secunda Secundae*, can serve as a safe guide in the

[42] Cfr. J. Bessmer, S.J., *Das menschliche Wollen* (Freiburg, 1915), pp. 2 sqq.

discussion of the problems of religious knowledge.

The theory of laws in the *Prima Secundae* (q. 90 sqq.), the doctrine of right, justice, etc., in the *Secunda Secundae*, together with the related or connected expositions, present in their *ensemble* the principal part of St. Thomas' philosophy of law, and of his political and social philosophy. The vast literature on these Thomistic doctrines, which extends far beyond the circle of Catholic theologians and savants, clearly shows the high value of this part of Thomism for to-day. E. Tröltsch, O. Gierke, W. Sombart, O. Spann, A. J. Carlyle, and others [43] in their works on sociology and political economy take into account the importance of St. Thomas in these matters. The enthusiastic words of R. Von Ihering in the second edition of his work, *Der Zweck im Recht*, are well known.[44] The teaching of

[43] See J. A. Ryan and M. F. X. Millar, S.J., *The State and the Church* (New York, 1923); Fr. Millar's article, *"Scholasticism and American Political Philosophy,"* in Zybura, *op. cit.*, pp. 301–341. (Tr.)

[44] Dr. Grabmann quotes them in his work, *Thomas Aquinas: His Personality and Thought* (tr. by Dr. Virgil Michel, O.S.B., New York and London, 1928), p. 161: "This great mind [Thomas] correctly understood the realistic-practical and the social factors of moral life, as well as the historical. . . . In amazement I ask myself how it is possible that such truths, once they were uttered, could be forgotten so completely by our Protestant savants? What false roads would have been spared, had they taken them to heart! For my part, I should probably not have written my book, had I known them; for the basic ideas I occupied myself with are to be found in that

the great Scholastic doctor on property, whose true historical relations to Communistic doctrine have been set forth by G. von Hertling, Fr. Walter, Fr. Schaub, S. Deploige, V. Cathrein, and others, acquires a greater significance in our time by reason of the ascendency of Socialism. The concept of democracy is likewise elucidated by the texts and ideas of St. Thomas.[45] The efforts to reconstruct international law on a Christian basis can find support in the ideas and views of this second part of the *Summa*.[46] Finally, this same part has an interest also for the history and philosophy of civilization. In this connection F. Kern [47] has formed the following estimate of St. Thomas: "Among the Scholastic precursors of Dante, Thomas is unquestionably the best student of civilization; in many respects he is not equaled even by Dante himself."

These are but a few instances which show that the

gigantic thinker in perfect clearness and in most pregnant formulation." (Tr.)

[45] V. Cathrein, S.J., *"Der 'Volksstaat' im Sinne des hl. Thomas von Aquin,"* in *Archiv für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie,* XII (1919), pp. 104–108.—S. J. McNamara, *American Democracy and Catholic Doctrine* (Brooklyn, N. Y., 1924). (Tr.)

[46] O. Schilling, *Das Völkerrecht nach Thomas von Aquin* (Freiburg, 1919).

[47] *Humana Civilitas* (*Staat, Kirche und Kultur*). *Eine Dante-Untersuchung* (Leipsic, 1913), p. 122; M. Grabmann, *Die Kulturphilosophie des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Augsburg, 1925).

Summa can be brought into living contact with modern civilization and science, and for that reason possesses a high value for to-day. This admirable synthesis of Aristotle and St. Augustine, going beyond both by its original contributions, participates in the imperishable power and influence of these great thinkers, who will remain "modern" for all times. On St. Thomas and his system E. De Bruyne [48] makes this opposite remark: "In him lives the immortal spirit of Greek genius and of Christian perfection." Francis Sylvestris of Ferrara, O.P., the commentator of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, justly calls St. Thomas the "*homo omnium horarum.*"

But the supreme value of the theological *Summa* for to-day, which is at the same time a value for eternity, as its very title indicates, arises from its aim and content, from that which constitutes the very centre of the intellectual life of its eminent and noble author: I mean his great purpose—the only one that is truly great—in the light of faith and reason to know God and the work of God as deeply and clearly as is possible here below, to order his whole life, interior as well as exterior, towards Him, and so, through absolute loyalty to God in this world, to come to see Him face to face and to possess

[48] *S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1928), p. 102.

Him without fear of loss for all eternity. It is in this sense that a theologian of former days and an enthusiastic admirer of St. Thomas and the *Summa Theologica*, the Jesuit Peter Labbe, wrote: "*Neque aliud superest, nisi lumen gloriae, post Summam Thomae.*"

Chapter IV

STRUCTURE OF THE *SUMMA THEOLOGICA*

In a preliminary question (q. 1) St. Thomas gives a clear exposition of the nature, value, and method of the science of theology, and then states the following main division of the whole work: "Because the chief aim of sacred doctrine is to teach the knowledge of God, not only as He is in Himself, but also as He is the beginning of things and their last end, and especially of rational creatures; therefore, in the first part (*Prima*) we shall treat of God, in the second part (*Secunda*), of the rational creature's advance towards God, in the third part (*Tertia*), of Christ, who, as man, is our way to God."

I. THE *PRIMA*

The treatise on God, which constitutes the great subject of the first part of the *Summa*, is divided into three main sections: the doctrine on the essence

of God (q. 2–26), on the Trinity of Persons (q. 27–43), and on Creation (q. 44–119).

The Treatise on the one God, or on the Divine Essence

Here the following questions are considered: Whether God exists (q. 2); what God is—respectively, what He is not (q. 3–13): what operations are proper to God (q. 14–26). The inquiry into the existence of God discusses the question of His knowability and develops the proofs for His existence. What God is, or better, what He is not, is determined by considering the attributes pertaining to the divine essence (q. 3–11): simplicity, perfection and goodness, infinity and omnipresence, immutability and eternity, and, finally, unity. This is followed by inquiries into our mode of knowing God and of naming Him in a manner that is theologically and logically correct (q. 12 and 13).

The treatise on the divine operations first studies the immanent activities of the divine intellect and will (q. 14–24). The doctrine on the knowledge of God treats of divine knowledge in itself, of divine ideas, and concludes with the teaching on truth and falsity. The question on the life of God (q. 18) leads over to the treatise on the will of God

(q. 19–24), which has for its subject the divine will in itself and in its absolute attributes (love, justice, mercy), as well as the divine operations common to the intellect and the will (providence, predestination and reprobation). The omnipotence of God is the principle of divine activity as manifested in creation (q. 25). The general doctrine on God comes to an end with the question on divine beatitude (q. 26).

The theology of the *Prima*, whether considered in its logical and metaphysical structure or analyzed according to its sources, is a masterpiece of clear and rigorous thinking, of the formative and systematic skill of Aquinas. From the results of the proofs for the existence of God are fashioned the elements of the idea of God, from which in turn are deduced the divine attributes in a manner that is so deep metaphysically, yet so obvious. The treatise on the logically and theologically correct names of God, by means of which we express our natural and supernatural knowledge of Him here below, gives St. Thomas the opportunity of developing his basic doctrine of the analogical character of this knowledge. The idea of God which St. Thomas has elaborated in this section of the *Prima* by a most happy combination of the penetrating metaphysics of being with the theological

method based on the sources of revelation, is also of fundamental importance for his conception of the relation existing between God and the world by reason of His creation, conservation of the world, and co-operation with the creatures. From the standpoint of history and analysis of sources this treatise of the *Prima* on God is an artistic texture in which the threads of biblical and patristic ideas (Pseudo-Areopagite, Augustine), of Aristotelian and Arabian-Jewish philosophy (Avicenna, Moses Maimonides), as well as those of preceding and contemporaneous Scholastic speculation are woven into a marvelous unity. The plastic genius of the great Scholastic gave form to these historical materials and quickened them with the soul of his own intellectual life.

The Treatise on the Trinity

This treatise is divided into three sections: the doctrine on the intra-trinitarian origins, the relations of which furnish the basis for the distinction of Persons (q. 27); the doctrine on the relations, which constitutes the core of the speculative teaching on the Trinity (q. 28), and the doctrine on the Divine Persons, absolutely and relatively regarded. Absolutely, the Divine Persons are considered first

generally and then individually (q. 33–38). The study of the Divine Persons in general begins with the elaboration of the metaphysical concept of person and its adaptation to the dogma of the Trinity (q. 29), and concludes with an inquiry into the knowability of the three Divine Persons and the relation between the Trinity and reason (q. 32). The consideration of the Divine Persons individually is made especially impressive by explaining the biblical and theological designations of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Relatively the Divine Persons are considered in their relation to the Divine Essence, to the trinitarian *proprietates* and *notiones*, and to one another. The treatise on the Trinity closes with an explanation of the "missions" of the Divine Persons (q. 43); here is also discussed the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the souls of the just, a subject that is exceedingly profitable for the religious and mystical life.

The Treatise on God the Creator

This treatise St. Thomas also divides into three parts: on the production of creatures (q. 44–46), on the various categories of creatures (q. 47–102), and on the divine conservation and governance of creatures (q. 103–119). The treatise on the pro-

duction of creatures, a masterpiece of profound metaphysical exposition, shows God to be the first cause of all things, develops the concept of creation, and points a safe way through the problems concerning the beginning of the world and of motion, problems which in the thirteenth century were often solved in an anti-Christian sense because of the influence of Aristotelianism and Averroism. The large section on the various categories of creatures begins with general reflections on the distinction of beings willed by God (q. 47), on the difference between good and evil and on the cause of evil (q. 48 f.). The kingdoms of creation are divided into the purely spiritual beings (angels), the purely corporeal beings, and human beings as the synthesis of mind and matter. The angelology (q. 50–64) consists of penetrating discussions on the nature of the angels, their intellect and knowledge, their will, their creation, their supernatural elevation, the sin and fall of the bad angels. The treatise on the purely corporeal creatures is a systematic exposition of the biblical hexaëmeron, "the work of the six days" (q. 65–74).

The philosophical and Aristotelian bent of St. Thomas becomes evident especially in the extensive section of the treatise which deals with man as the synthesis of spirit and body (q. 75–102). The

theological aim of the *Summa* demands that human nature be studied especially from the side of the soul. The body is considered only in its relation to the soul. This theological anthropology is divided into two sections: the predominantly philosophical exposition of the nature of man (q. 75–89), and the dogmatic discussion of the creation of the first man. The treatise on the nature of man, in which the psychology of Aquinas appears in its most compact form, treats of the essence (q. 75–76), powers (q. 77–83), and operations (q. 84–89) of the human soul. The inquiry into the essence of the human soul brings out sharply the personal teaching of St. Thomas on the spiritual soul as the only substantial form in man. The division of the powers of the soul and the stressing of their real distinction from its substance are inspired by Aristotle and Avicenna. Of the operations proceeding from the powers of the soul, St. Thomas here considers only those of the intellect, while the acts and habits of the will and of the sensitive appetite, because of their ethical significance, are dealt with in the treatise on morals in the second part of the *Summa*. The exposition of the operations of the intellect takes on the form of a complete theory and psychology of knowledge with an Aristotelian impress, without wholly obliterating the Augustinian elements.

The third part of the treatise on Creation (q. 103–119) considers the divine governance of the universe in general and in particular. The specific effects of this governance are the divine conservation of the universe and the divine movement of creatures. The latter is carried into effect in part directly by God (divine co-operation with the activities of creatures), in part by means of creatures. Here, as a supplement to angelology, is added a detailed discussion of the influence of the angels on one another, on material things, and on men (q. 106–114). The treatise on creation comes to a close with three questions: on the causality of man in his mental and moral influence on other men, the psychology of teaching and learning (q. 117), in his influence on material things, and in the propagation of the human race (q. 117–119).

II. THE *SECUNDA*

The second part of the theological *Summa* studies man in so far as he is a free moral being and, as such, has it in his power to tend towards God as his last end, but also to turn away from Him. In other words, the theme of this second main division is the last end of human life and the means

that lead to it. These means may be considered in general and in particular. The doctrine on the last end of man and the general means thereto constitutes the content of the first section, called the *Prima Secundae;* the study of the particular means to this end forms the subject of the second and more extensive section called the *Secunda Secundae.*

This division into the *Prima Secundae* and the *Secunda Secundae,* which appears in the manuscripts of the thirteenth century and in the catalogue of the University of Paris for the years 1275–1286,[1] is pointed out by Ptolemy of Lucca, who supplies the following information concerning the division of the theological *Summa*:[2] "Thomas divided the *Summa* into three parts: the *Summa naturalis,* because he there treats of the nature of things, first of the nature of God and then of created things. The second part he called the *Summa moralis,* which he subdivided into two volumes. The first volume deals with the general subjects of morality and is termed the *Prima Secundae.* The second volume contains the exposition of the particular virtues and vices; it is founded on and enriched with the sayings and reasons of philoso-

[1] Denifle, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* Vol. I (Paris, 1889), p. 646.

[2] *Historia ecclesiastica,* l. 22, c. 39.

phers and the authorities of the sacred doctrine. This volume we call the *Secunda Secundae*. The third part of the *Summa*, which forms the fourth volume of the work, is called the *Summa sacramentalis*, because it treats of the Sacraments and the Incarnation."

1. *The Prima Secundae*

In two sections of unequal length the *Prima Secundae* treats of the last end of man and of human actions as means for the attainment of that end; and it considers these actions in general.

The treatise on the last end (q. 1–5) first deals with the last end in general and then with happiness, in which the last end of man consists, by discussing its true nature and the highest form and content in which this end is realized in the beatific vision. Here St. Thomas inserts the biblical-Christian conception of man's last end and true happiness in the framework of the Aristotelian doctrine on goodness and nappiness.

As this happiness is attained by the acts of man, theology must consider the *actus humani* and investigate which acts lead us to happiness and which hinder us from reaching it. The general study of these human acts constitutes the subject of the

large remaining part of the *Prima Secundae* (q. 6–114). This general consideration of human acts is divided into two main sections: the treatise on human acts in themselves (q. 6–48), and that on the principles of these acts (q. 49–114).

The Treatise on Human Acts

Human acts are of two kinds: those which are proper to man by reason of the spiritual part of his nature, and those which he has in common with animals by reason of the sensitive sphere of his soul. As happiness is a good proper to man and one that he does not hold in common with animals, the acts peculiar to man because of his intellectual and moral nature stand in a much closer relation to happiness than the activities which man has in common with animals, even though in a higher form than they. Therefore, the author must first consider the acts proper to man (q. 6–22), and then those which we have in common with animals (q. 23–48). The exposition of St. Thomas on the acts proper to man is a very searching and keen psychological-ethical analysis of the operations of the human will. He first studies these in general (q. 6–7) and then in particular (q. 8–22). Here are first explained the acts which proceed immediately from

the will (*actus eliciti*) and according to the various forms which they assume. These forms of activity refer partly to the attitude of the will towards the end itself (liking for the end or object, endeavor to attain it, possession and enjoyment of it; q. 8–12), partly to the will's bearing towards the ways and means that lead to the end (deliberation, consent, choice; q. 13–16). Then follows an inquiry into the moral actions proper to man which do not proceed immediately from the will, but are performed by other powers at its command and with its responsibility (*actus imperati a voluntate;* q. 17).

The ethical aspects of the immediate and mediate acts of the will and the metaphysical anchorage of Thomistic ethics are dealt with in the treatise on the moral goodness and badness of human acts and on their essential relation to merit and guilt, rewards and punishment (q. 18–21). The explanation of the acts which man has in common with animals is given by St. Thomas in his deservedly much praised treatise *De passionibus*, in his theory of the emotions and passions (q. 22–48). Here he first considers the affective movements in general from their psychological and ethical side, their division, and their mutual relation (q. 22–25); then the individual movements of the concupiscible

and irascible parts of the appetitive faculty. The single affective movements are studied in their characteristics, causes, effects, and ethical significance. The original utilization of a rich source-material and an abundance of psychological observations impart high value to this treatise, which has no equal in all Scholastic literature.

The Interior and Exterior Principles of Human Acts

After having thus studied the nature of human acts, St. Thomas proceeds to consider their principles. These are interior and exterior. As the powers or faculties were already discussed as principles in the psychological section of the *Prima*, the treatise on the interior principles is here concerned with the investigation of habits, which must likewise be taken into account as principles of human acts (q. 49–89). This treatise on habits is first a general one (q. 49–54), enlightening us on the nature of habits, their psychical seat, the cause of their genesis, growth, diminution, destruction, and finally on their division. Here St. Thomas has shed a clear light on one of the most knotty problems of Scholastic psychology and ethics, on which

Durandus subsequently wrote a monograph.

From the ethical standpoint habits are fundamentally divided into morally good and morally bad habits. Accordingly, Aquinas also divides his special treatise on habits into two parts: the doctrine on the good habits or virtues (q. 55–70), and that on the bad habits or vices (q. 71–89). The doctrine on virtues treats of the nature of virtues, their psychological seat, and their division into intellectual (dianoëtic), moral, cardinal, and theological virtues; then it expatiates on the cause of virtues, on their attributes, that is, on the golden mean as the norm of ethical conduct, on their inner mutual connection, their place according to rank, and their continuance in the future life. Even though Aristotelian ideas appear in the division of the virtues and in the doctrine of the golden mean, yet the Thomistic treatise on virtues is far from being a mere reproduction of the *Nicomachaean Ethics;* it is a Christian doctrine, drawing very copiously from biblical and patristic sources, and its ethical teaching here and there towers to the heights of mysticism. The doctrine on the theological virtues and the questions on the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the beatitudes, and the fruits of the Holy Ghost, with which this treatise on the virtues

concludes (q. 68–70), brings out with special distinctness this Christian and mystical character of Thomistic teaching on this subject.

The treatise on the bad habits or vices has a structure similar to that on virtues. It deals with the nature of sin, its division, its psychical subject or seat (q. 71–75) and, in considerable detail, with its causes (q. 76–84). The causes of sin are partly internal (ignorance, weakness, malice; q. 76–78), partly external (q. 79–84). Here an exceptionally detailed exposition is devoted to the doctrine on original sin, its nature, its transmission, its seat in the soul, etc. (q. 81–84). In logical sequence the treatise on the causes of sin is followed by that on the effects of sin under the threefold aspect of the impairment of the naturally good dispositions in man, of the stain it leaves in the soul, and of punishment (q. 85–89). Here the opportunity is taken to set forth the difference between mortal and venial sin (q. 88–89).

The final section of the *Prima Secundae* is devoted to the consideration of the external principles of human acts (q. 90–114). The external principle of good actions is God, who moves us to what is good, and that in two ways: by law which directs us and by grace which assists us. Thus we have the two

treatises on law and on grace. The treatise of St. Thomas on law first studies law in general, in its general foundations of the metaphysical, psychological, and ethical order (q. 90–97), and contains expositions of the eternal law, the moral law of nature, and positive human law, which extend far beyond matters of purely theological interest. The special treatise on law is concerned with the law of the Old Testament, whose moral, ritualistic, and judiciary precepts are developed in a manner evincing an extensive knowledge of biblical archeology (q. 98–105), and with the law of the New Covenant, the *lex nova*, the investigation of which assumes the form of a deep and striking presentation of the intrinsic and primary divine forces of Christianity, and becomes a dogmatic treatise on the essence of Christianity (q. 106–108). The *Prima Secundae* is completed and crowned by the treatise on grace (q. 109–114), in which the supernatural character of the moral doctrine of St. Thomas receives its profound dogmatic confirmation. With sharp strokes Aquinas here establishes the necessity of divine grace and explains its nature, its penetration of man's higher life, its divisions, and its effects in justification and the acquisition of supernatural merit for eternal life.

2. *The Secunda Secundae*

St. Thomas begins the *Secunda Secundae* with a long Prologue in which he broadly outlines the much more complicated arrangement of this main division and justifies it with a fine sense for method: "After the general treatise of virtues and vices, and other matters connected with the subject of morals, we must now consider each of these things in particular: for there is little use in speaking about moral matters in general, since actions are about particular things. Now moral matters can be considered in particular from two points of view: first, from the point of view of the moral matter itself, for instance, by considering a particular virtue or a particular vice; secondly, from the point of view of the various states of man, for instance, by considering subjects and superiors, active life and contemplative life, or any other differences among men." [3]

"Accordingly, we shall treat first in a special way of those matters which regard all the states of man, secondly in a special way, of those matters which regard particular states. As to the first, we must observe that if we were to treat of each virtue, gift,

[3] *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas,* Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London and New York, 1917), Part II, First Number, p. 1 (Tr.).

vice and precept separately, we should have to say the same thing over and over again. For if one wished to treat adequately of this precept: *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, he would have to inquire about adultery which is a sin, the knowledge about which depends on his knowledge of the opposite virtue. The shorter and quicker method, therefore, will be if we include the consideration of each virtue, together with its corresponding gift, opposite vice, and affirmative and negative precepts, in the same treatise . . ."

In this manner the treatise on morals in this first part of the *Secunda Secundae* is reduced to the treatise on virtues. The virtues themselves are reducible to seven: the three theological virtues, which are considered first, and the four cardinal virtues, which comprise all the moral virtues. Of the intellectual virtues prudence is a cardinal virtue; *ars* (readiness or skill) does not belong to the domain of morality. Wisdom, understanding, and knowledge are met with, under the same name but with supernatural contents, among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

The Special Treatise on Virtues. The Theological Virtues

The first part of the *Secunda Secundae* contains the special doctrine on virtues (q. 1–170). It begins with the exposition of the three theological virtues (q. 1–46). Following the standard of division explained in the prologue, the treatise on faith, the first theological virtue, first studies faith itself (q. 1–7); then the gifts of the Holy Ghost corresponding to the virtue of faith, the gifts of understanding and knowledge (q. 8 f.); the sins opposed to faith—unbelief, heresy, apostasy, blasphemy, and the sins against the Holy Ghost; blindness of mind and religious ignorance, as being opposed to the gifts of understanding and knowledge (q. 15); finally, the precepts relating to faith (q. 16).

The treatise on faith is one of the most brilliant achievements of Thomistic theology, and of paramount importance not only for the doctrine on morals, but also for the theological theory and psychology of knowledge. It considers the object of faith, the interior and exterior act of faith (q. 2 f.), the habit of faith, the virtue of faith in its subjects, in its cause, and in its effects (q. 4–7). The *veritas prima* as the object of faith: this is the

monumental portal, as it were, through which the first *quaestio* introduces us to the Thomistic doctrine on the virtues. The manner in which Aquinas ultimately founds the certitude of faith on God as the self-revealing First Truth, which is at once the object, means, and cause of belief, is characteristic of his whole supernatural way of thinking. The treatise on divine hope deals with the virtue itself and its psychical seat (q. 17 f.), with the corresponding gift of the fear of God (q. 19), with despair and presumption, sins opposed to hope (q. 20 f.), and with the divine precepts relating to hope (q. 22).

The most beautiful treatise of the *Secunda Secundae*, which breathes the saintly life of Aquinas, is that on the love of God (q. 23–46). In the very first article he characterizes this love as a life of intimacy with God—a designation pregnant with meaning also for the doctrine on mysticism. First we are made acquainted with the nature of the theological virtue of love, its psychical seat, and its rôle in the life of the soul (q. 23 f.). Here the question of the growth of love and its degrees of perfection is discussed with Scholastic lucidity and mystical impressiveness. With a strictly systematic development of ideas the doctrine on the nature of love is followed by questions on the ob-

ject and the order of love (q. 25 f.), on the act of divine love which is at the same time love of neighbor, on the acts and states which flow directly from love, and which are partly its interior effects like joy, peace, a charitable disposition; partly exterior, like beneficence, almsdeeds, fraternal correction (q. 27–33). Then the sins opposed to these acts of love are considered (q. 34–43): to the act of love itself is opposed hatred; to interior joy, spiritual sloth, lukewarmness, and envy; to peace, discord, strife, schism, war. The moral justification of war is conceded under certain circumstances and conditions, etc. Finally, to beneficence is opposed scandal. The treatise concludes with the exposition of the precepts relating to love (q. 44), and of the gift of wisdom which elevates love to the heights of mystical contemplation (q. 45).

The Moral (Cardinal) Virtues and their Ramifications.

To the norms of division hitherto applied (virtue, gift, contrary sin, precept), another is added in the treatise on the cardinal virtues, namely, the classification into partial virtues which are connected with a cardinal virtue as its subordinate parts. Because of their direct influence on the man-

ifold manifestations of concrete life, the cardinal virtues naturally have ramifications much more complicated and extended than the theological virtues. Here St. Thomas had at his disposal the *Nicomachaean Ethics* with its plan of division in the doctrine on virtues. Despite the many difficulties, his solution of the problem of a clear systematic arrangement was a veritable stroke of genius. We have already called attention to this on a previous occasion. In the classification of virtues St. Thomas employs the concepts of the *pars integralis* (as, for example, the walls, roof, foundation are integral parts of a house), the *pars subjectiva* (as the ox and the lion are parts of the species "animal"), and the *pars potentialis* (as the vegetative force and sensitive appetite are parts of the soul; q. 48, art. 1). Accordingly, the subordinate virtues are related to the respective cardinal virtue either as its *partes integrales*, integrant essential parts without which the act of the cardinal virtue cannot be performed, or as its *partes subjectivae*, inferior forms of the principal virtue, or as being akin to it as its *partes potentiales*. In the following survey I cannot call special attention to all these subordinate virtues, but only to the most important.

The cardinal virtue of prudence (q. 47–56) is clearly explained in its essence, its integral, sub-

jective, and potential parts—where its connection with the Aristotelian dianoëtic virtues is shown—in the gift of the Holy Ghost corresponding to it, namely, counsel, in the sins opposed to it, and in the precepts relating to it. In this Thomistic treatise on the virtues, the most extensive portion is devoted to the cardinal virtue of justice (q. 57–122). The initial disquisition, which is of the highest importance for jurisprudence, is that on right and justice and their basic forms; here an abundance of ideas, especially Aristotelian, is utilized in an original manner (q. 57–60). In the discussion of the parts or kinds of justice the group of subordinate virtues is contrasted with the corresponding group of sins. Thus the subjective parts of justice, distributive and commutative, are contrasted with all the sins that injure the person or property or good name of our neighbor (q. 61–78).

Of the *partes potentiales* of the virtue of justice, the first to be considered is the virtue of religion, with the sins opposed to it (q. 79–100). Here St. Thomas develops a detailed theory of religion with its interior and exterior acts: devotion, prayer, sacrifice, oath, etc. The contrary sins dealt with exhaustively are superstition, perjury, sacrilege, and simony. In a clear-cut arrangement and with an exceptional richness of ideas he explains filial

respect towards parents and the whole domain of duties towards the State and society as potential parts of justice (q. 101–105). Of the sins against human society it is especially untruthfulness which is studied thoroughly and earnestly (q. 109–113), because it is man's duty to show himself to his neighbor as he is. Friendship and liberality also come within the ambit of justice (q. 114–120). The treatise on justice ends with an exposition of the gift of piety as the corresponding gift of the Holy Ghost, and of the divine precepts which regulate justice (q. 121 f.).

In the study of the cardinal virtue of fortitude (q. 123–140), the most sublime manifestation of which is martyrdom, the subordinate virtues are ranged from the standpoint of daring (*actus aggrediendi*) and of enduring (*actus sustinendi*) what is arduous; of the first kind magnanimity is especially pointed out; of the second, patience and perseverance. The corresponding gift of the Holy Ghost is fortitude. Great demands on the systematizing skill of St. Thomas were made by the fourth cardinal virtue, temperance, with its numerous ramifications into subordinate virtues (q. 141–170). Shame and honesty (q. 144 f.) are considered as integral parts of this virtue. The subjective parts of temperance regulate the enjoyment of

food and drink by the virtues of abstinence and fasting (q. 146–150), and sexual desire by the virtues of chastity and virginity. Of these two virtues St. Thomas treats with exceeding tenderness and emphasizes their religious significance, while expressing himself with refined restraint on unchastity and its varieties (q. 151–154). These pages mirror the innocent, pure, and heavenly-minded soul of the Angelic Doctor. The potential parts of temperance are self-restraint (*continentia*), clemency and meekness, and modesty (q. 155–169). A very detailed exposition is devoted to modesty in general, its subdivisions, and the sins opposed to it. In the question on humility (q. 161), in which the Benedictine element of Thomistic thought comes to the fore, the Saint unwittingly gives us another insight into his interior life.

The attitude of St. Thomas towards secular culture is well exemplified in the section on ordinate and inordinate desire for knowledge (*studiositas —curiositas;* q. 166 f.), and on the virtue of *eutropelia,* which regulates man's amusements, recreation, and exterior behavior in general (q. 168 f.).

On the whole, the *Secunda Secundae,* where scientific depth and clearness are combined with knowledge of life and men, contains abundant material

for the eminent Scholastic's philosophy of culture.[4]

The Treatise on the States and Kinds of Life

While the foregoing doctrine on the virtues holds good for all men and all states of life, the second and smaller main division of the *Secunda Secundae* considers and appraises the particular states and kinds of life (q. 171–189). St. Thomas notes a threefold difference in the states of life. The first is that of the extraordinary manifestations of divine grace (*gratiae gratis datae;* q. 171–178). What St. Thomas has written here on prophecy and ecstasy is of permanent value for the theological estimate of these unusual phenomena. The second difference results from the distinction between the active and the contemplative life (q. 179–182). With the vivid and warm colors of his profound theological thought and his glowing love for God, the Saint has drawn a surpassingly beautiful picture of the contemplative life, and has enriched his *Summa* with a deep and living theory of mysticism; at the same time he fully realizes the importance, the high moral and religious value of the

[4] Cfr. M. Grabmann, *Die Kulturphilosophie des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Augsburg, 1925). (Tr.)

active life. He guards against a one-sided overestimation of the contemplative life, verified in many writings of his contemporaries in the religious Orders; to his mind the highest form of the Christian life is the *vita mixta*—the harmonious combination and mutual penetration of the contemplative and the active life. The third difference in the states and kinds of life comes from the relation to Christian perfection. Because Aquinas holds that Christian perfection consists in love, and because he distinguishes between the religious state of perfection and the condition of being perfect, his exposition of the states of perfection, especially of religious Orders, presents a wide and eminently Catholic horizon. The treatise on the religious state, with which the *Secunda Secundae* concludes, is the deepest, most beautiful, and most sensible ever written, in a strictly theological context, on religious life in the Catholic Church (q. 183–189).

III. THE *TERTIA*

In broad outline St. Thomas indicates the structure of the *Tertia* in a brief prologue:[5] "Forasmuch as Our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, by

[5] *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas,* Part III, First Number, p. 1. (Tr.)

saving His people from their sins (Matt., I, 21), as the angel announced, showed unto us in His own Person the way of truth, whereby we may attain to the bliss of eternal life by resurrection, it is necessary, in order to complete the work of theology, that after considering the last end of human life and virtues and vices, there should follow the consideration of the Saviour of all, and of the benefits bestowed by Him on the human race. Concerning which we must consider—(1) the Saviour Himself; (2) the Sacraments by which we attain to our salvation; (3) the end of immortal life to which we attain by the resurrection."

The Treatise on Jesus Christ, the Saviour

The treatise on Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world (q. 1–59), is divided into two main sections. The first deals with the mystery of the Incarnation, whereby the Son of God became man for our salvation (q. 1–26); the second, with the mysteries of the life, passion, death, and glorification of Christ (q. 27–59). The doctrine on the Incarnation considers three things: the fitness of the Incarnation (q. 1), the manner of union of the Incarnate Word with human nature (q. 2–15), the consequences of

this hypostatic union for Christ (q. 16–26). With an abundance of patristic material the preliminary *quaestio* elucidates the necessity and fitness of the Incarnation—questions introduced into Scholastic theology by Anselm of Canterbury—and the purpose of the Incarnation. The inquiry into the manner of union of the Incarnate Logos, the hypostatic union, shows a rich and well-weighed arrangement. This union of the Divine Logos with human nature in Christ is first studied from the standpoint of the union itself (q. 2), which is shown to be a hypostatic union; then from that of the divine Person of the Logos assuming human nature (q. 3); finally, from that of the human nature assumed into this union (q. 4–15). Here again two things are considered: first, the human nature assumed by the Word, the several parts of this human nature, and the order of their assumption into the hypostatic union (q. 4–6); secondly, what the Word coassumed, both as to perfections and as to defects (q. 7–15). The perfections are: the grace of Christ as an individual man—the grace of union and sanctifying grace, His grace as the head of redeemed mankind or of the Church (q. 7 f.), the knowledge of Christ's human soul in its three forms, beatific, infused, and acquired (q. 9–12), and the power of Christ's soul (q. 13). The defects of Christ's human

nature are its capability to suffer in body and soul (q. 14 f).

The consequences of the hypostatic union appertain to Christ in three ways: as regards Himself, His relation to the Father, and His relation to us. The consequences and effects for Christ Himself refer to His being and becoming (q. 16, the doctrine on the *communicatio idiomatum*), to His unity of being (q. 17), of will, that is, the conformity of His human will with the divine will (q. 18), and unity of the theandric operations, inasmuch as His humanity acts as the instrument of the Logos (q. 19). What St. Thomas has here set forth concerning the unity of being and operation in Christ is one of the most profound and most difficult expositions he has written, and gives us an insight into his sublime conception of the hypostatic union. The consequences for Christ in relation to the Father are bilateral, inasmuch as they concern the relation of the Son to the Father and the relation of the Father to the Son. As regards the first, we have detailed and searching discussions of Christ's subjection to the Father (q. 20), of His life of prayer (q. 21), and of His priesthood (q. 22); as regards the second, of the divine Sonship of Christ as man (q. 23), and of the predestination of Christ (q. 24). The consequences of the

hypostatic union for us are the adorableness of Christ also in His human nature (q. 25), and His mediatorial office (q. 26).

The second part of the doctrine of Christ the Saviour, the treatise on the mysteries of His life, passion, and glorification, introduces us into the life of Jesus from the dogmatic standpoint of the significance for salvation of the various phases and events of the Saviour's earthly career. St. Thomas divides this treatise into four sections: the consideration of the events accompanying Christ's entry into the world (q. 27–39); of the events of His life on earth, especially those of His public teaching activity (q. 40–45); of the events connected with His departure from the world in His passion and death (q. 46–52); finally, of the forms of His exaltation and glorification (q. 53–59). The first section studies the conception (q. 27–34), birth (q. 35 f.), circumcision (q. 37), and baptism of Christ (q. 38 f.). In the theological consideration of the childhood of the Lord, St. Thomas inserts his profound dogmatic Mariology. The second section deals with the earthly sojourn (q. 40), the temptation, teaching, and miracles of Christ (q. 40–46). The third section is a theologically profound consideration, very profitable for the religious life, of Christ's passion in its essence,

causes, and effects (q. 46–49) and of His death, burial, and descent into hell (q. 50–52). The exposition of the manner in which Christ's passion worked out our salvation and of the effects of His passion (q. 48 f.) constitutes a complete Soteriology, and also contains the deep personal teaching of St. Thomas on the physical efficacy of Christ in His work of redemption. The fourth section treats of the Resurrection (q. 53–56), the Ascension (q. 57–58), and the judiciary power of Christ (q. 59).

The entire treatise of the *Tertia* on the Incarnation is a masterpiece of positive combined with speculative theology. St. Thomas has at his disposal an extensive knowledge of patristic literature, including the Greek Fathers, and of doctrinal decisions and development; and he shows his full metaphysical skill in the way in which he fathoms and fashions the most knotty problems. There is also a mystical afflatus unobtrusively diffused over this picture of Christ's person and work, drawn by St. Thomas in the evening of his life.

The Treatise on the Sacraments

The theological consideration of the mysteries of the Incarnate Word is followed by a treatise on

the Sacraments of the Church, which derive their efficacy from Him. There is a general and a special doctrine on the Sacraments. In six questions the first deals with the concept and essence of the Sacraments, their necessity, their efficacy in regard to grace, the sacramental character, the causes of the Sacraments, and their number (q. 60–65). After a long and arduous ascent the Scholastic teaching on the Sacraments has reached the summit of perfection in these questions. I cannot enter into details here, because I am concerned only with the systematic structure of the *Summa*. The careful elaboration of the Christological background of sacramental theology and the application of the metaphysical theory of the *causa instrumentalis* to the efficacy of the Sacraments and their mode of operation, give to this exposition of St. Thomas an impress of its own. In the light of historical research concerning Scholastic teaching on the Sacraments, it will appear with increasing distinctness how much that is great and new St. Thomas has created here.

Of the special treatise on the Sacraments St. Thomas was able to finish only the sections on Baptism (q. 66–71), Confirmation (q. 72), Holy Eucharist (q. 73–83), and a part of that on Penance (q. 84–90). In the questions on the Holy

Eucharist St. Thomas gives evidence of his superlative metaphysical talent in the exposition of the doctrine of transubstantiation; and his religious earnestness and depth—the mystical traits of his interior life—are revealed in the strikingly beautiful consideration of the effects of Holy Communion (see particularly, q. 79, art. 1). As the Eucharistic poems of Aquinas continue to live in the liturgy of the Church, so the questions of the *Tertia* on the Holy Eucharist also have an imperishable value in Catholic theology. From the unfinished treatise on Penance we can infer how much that is profound and new the great theologian would have contributed to these difficult problems if death had not cut short his literary labors. St. Thomas Aquinas died when he was about to treat of the theory of contrition, with which the earlier Scholastics had wrestled. His pure and holy life, devoted to the search for truth and to the love of God and man, had in it but little to repent of. An old manuscript of the *Tertia*, preserved in the Chapter Library of Toledo (*Cod.* 19–13), concludes with these words: "*Hic moritur Thomas, ecclesie lumen, orbis decus, theologorum gemma.*"

INDEX

Abbreviaturae, 46 f.
Abélard, Peter, 3, 61, 79
Ach, N., 172
Acts, Human, 187 ff.
Adam of Bocfeld, 91
Aegidius of Lessines, 160
—— of Rome, 69, 92, 160
Agnosticism, 168
Alanus de Insulis, 4, 149
Albert of Brescia, 69, 164
—— the Great, 6, 8, 34, 63, 75, 77, 80, 81, 111, 123, 124, 134, 149, 152, 153 ff.
Alexander of Aphrodisias, 7, 19
—— of Hales, 8, 63, 75, 76, 80, 81, 96, 98, 123, 152
Anselm of Canterbury, 122, 206
—— of Laon, 2, 71
Anthropology, 172, 184
Arintero, J. G., 167
Aristotelianism, Christian, 34 f., 71, 122, 151, 162, 191 f.
Aristotle, 6, 7, 15, 19, 31, 34, 79 f., 91 f., 116, 123, 146, 147, 151, 176
Armenian version of the *Summa,* 47 f.
Augustine, St., 145, 147, 148, 163, 171, 176, 181
Aureolus, 159
Autograph of St. Thomas, 136
Aveling, F., 169
Avencebrol, 147
Averroes, 147
Averroism, 152, 183
Avicenna, 5, 36, 147, 181, 184

Baeumker, Cl., 109, 122, 148
Bail, 135
Balthasar, 170
Bancel, L., 165
Bañez, D., 52 f., 119
Baptism, 119
Barthier, 165
Bartholomew of Bruges, 92
—— of Capua, 28
Bate, Hy., 63
Baumgartner, M., 24, 111 f.
"Bene de me scripsisti . . ." 22
Benedict XIV, 85
—— XV, 57
—— of Assignano, 46
Bernard Guidonis, 104
—— of Clermont, 44, 69, 158
—— of Trilia, 44, 69, 99
Bernold of Constance, 79
Berthier, J. J., 102, 103
Biel, Stan., 50
Billot, 57
Billuart, 53
Boëtius of Dacia, 91
Bonaventure, St., 80, 99, 126, 134, 156

Bossuet, 165
Bramante, 153
Brentano, Fr., 101
Bühler, K., 169
Bulletin Thomiste, 166
Buonpensiere, 58, 66

Cajetan, Cardinal, 50, 65, 129
Cano, M., 52
Capponi a Porrecta, 54, 65
Carlyle, A. J., 174
Catena aurea, 19
Cathala, 35
Cathrein, V., 175
Chardon, 134
Chenu, M. D., 150
Chossat, 168
Christ, 136, 205 ff.
Christology, 76, 114 f., 126, 205
Chronology of the writings of St. Thomas, 16 ff., 23 ff.
Civilization, 175
Clapwell, Richard, 158
Classification of the writings of St. Thomas, 10 ff.
Clement IV, 20, 21, 25
—— de Terra Salsa, 48
Cloche, 53
Coconnier, Th., 42, 137, 142
Commentaries on Aristotle, 15
Commentaries on the *Summa Theologica,* 49 ff.; Recent, 57 f., 142
Commentary on the Sentences, 18, 35 f., 90
Concordances of the *Summa Theologica,* 46
Conflict about the teaching of St. Thomas after his death, 157 ff.
Constantius, 37
Contemplative life, 203 f.
Contenson, 135
Contra impugnantes Dei cultum, 18
Conway, 23
Correctorium Fratris Thomae, 122
Correctoria Corruptorii, 157 f.
Cowton, Robert, 158
Creation, 182 ff.
Creator, Treatise on God the, 182 ff.
Crockart, P., 50
Cursus theologicus Salmanticensis, 54

Dante, 69, 116, 175
De Bruyne, E., 176
De ente et essentia, 17
Demetrios Kydones, 47
Denifle, H., 25, 92, 153
Deploige, S., 112, 172, 175
De regimine principum, 39
Descoqs, 170
Destrez, 12
De unitate intellectus, 16, 39
Development, Interior, of the *Summa,* 106 ff.
De Wulf, M., 23
Diekamp, 87 f.
Dionysius Cartusianus, 48
—— the (Pseudo-) Areopagite, 147, 155, 181
Disputationes, 11 ff.
Division of the *Summa,* 107 f.
"Divus Thomas sui interpres," 10, 43, 140 ff.
Dogma, History of, 156
Dominicans, 6, 15, 49, 53
Dominic of Flanders, 35
Dörholt, B., 102

Durandus, 158, 159
Duval, 56

Eckhart, Master, 160
Ehrle, 12, 57, 156, 157
Emotions, 189 ff.
End of man, 187 f.
English translation of the *Summa*, 58
Epistemology of St. Thomas, 170
Essence, Divine, 179 ff.
Estius, W., 44
Ethics, 172, 187 ff. (See Moral theology)
Eucharist, 211
Exegesis, see Scripture
Experience, 112, 168 f.

Fasoli, 65
Fathers, Greek, 7, 147, 209; Latin, 148
Ferre, 53, 65
Fishacre, R., 62, 89
Francis de Sales, St., 134
—— of Vitoria, 50, 52
Franciscans, 6

Galea, 59
Galienus Ozto, 47, 110
Gamachaeus, 56, 65
Gandulphus, 3
Gardeil, A., 146, 167
Garrigou-Lagrange, 163, 167, 170
Gass, W., 111, 125
Gemelli, A., 170
Gerard of Abbeville, 18, 149
—— of Bologna, 64
—— of Elten, 49
German translation of the *Summa*, Early, 48
Gervasi, L., 40
Geyer, B., 3
Geyser, Jos., 170
Gierke, O., 174
Gilbert de la Porrée, 3
Gilson, E., 134, 170
Girolami, 69
God, Treatise on, 178 ff.
Godfrey of Fontaines, 158
—— of Poitiers, 77
Grabmann, M., 168, 174
Grace, 193, 203
Granado, 56, 65
Greek translation of the *Summa*, 47
Gregory the Great, 148
Gregory X, 21
—— of Rimini, 161
—— of Valencia, 56, 65
Grundkötter, 165
Grunwald, Caspar, 49
Gualindi, 102
Gutberlet, C., 169

Hauteville, 135
Heidegger, M., 171
Henry of Brussels, 92
—— of Ghent, 9, 91, 158
—— of Gorcum, 26, 48
Hertling, G. v., 145, 175
Hervaeus de Cauda, 45
—— Natalis, 69, 158, 160
Hirscher, J. B. v., 111
Historical method of interpreting the *Summa*, 143 ff.
History of the *Summa Theologica*, 43 ff.
Horváth, A., 162
Hugh of St. Cher, 89
—— of St. Victor, 2 f., 61
Humanism, 51 f.

Hurtado, 56
Hypostatic union, 206 ff.

Ihering, R. v., 174
Incarnation, 205 ff.
Influence of the *Summa*, 128 ff.
International law, 175
Interpretation of the *Summa*, 138 ff.
Isidore of Seville, 2, 148
Ivo of Chartres, 79

James of Viterbo, 100
Janssens, L., 58
Janvier, 165
Jeiler, Ign., 127, 152, 156
Jerome Dungersheim, 48
Jesuits, 55
John XXI, 152
—— XXII, 47
—— Capreolus, 48, 141, 160
—— Damascene, 147
—— de Rupella, 4
—— de Torquemada, 51
—— Dominici, 47
—— Lector, 4, 153
—— of Bologna, 9
—— of Cajatia, 69
—— of Dacia, 4
—— of Faenza, 160
—— of Lichtenberg, 9
—— of Naples, 69, 160
—— of St. Thomas, 53, 102, 107
—— of Sterngassen, 69
—— Quidort of Paris, 158
—— Tinctoris, 49
Joret, J., 167
Jourdain, Ch., 23
Justice, 200 f.

Kennedy, P., 103
Kern, F., 175
Kleutgen, Jos., 131
Koch, J., 159
Köllin, C., 50
Kremer, 170
Külpe, O., 169

Labbe, P., 177
Lacordaire, 87
Landgraf, A., 150 f.
Lavaud, L., 162
Laws, Theory of, 174, 193
Lectio, 11 ff.
Leo XIII, 57
Leonard of Brixental, 49
Leone a Lycio, 54
Lepicier, 58
Liber Sententiarum, 1 f.
Liechty, R. de, 154
Liturgy, 70
"Logica nova", 79
Logos, 206
Lottin, O., 24, 150
Louis IX, 21 f.
Lyons, 102

Mahieu, H., 166
Makay, 37
Malderus, 56
Mandonnet, 24, 28, 29, 31, 42, 43, 152, 158
March, J., 160
Maréchal, J., 170
Marinis, Dominic de, 53
Mariology, 208
Maritain, J., 170
Martin of Cremona, 5, 61, 76
—— of Dacia, 91
Massoulié, A., 10, 134, 140 f.
Matthew of Aquasparta, 99
Maumus, V., 165
Mausbach, J., 23, 172
Medices a Camerino, 54

Medina, B., 53, 86 f.
Meier, M., 148
Mercier, D., 170
Method, see Technique
Meynard, 165
Mezger, P., 54
Michel, V., 174
Michelangelo, 154
Michotte, A., 173
Millar, M. F. X., 174
Minges, Parthenius, 98, 121, 152 f.
Modern thought, 167 f.
Modern traits of the *Summa*, 173 ff.
Molina, 65
Moneta, 5
Monsabré, 165
Moral theology, 110 f.
Moses Maimonides, 147, 168, 181
Mysticism, 70, 133 ff., 165 ff., 203

Nazarius, 53
Neo-Platonism, 147, 155
New Scholasticism, The, 170
Nicholas of Lisieux, 18
—— of Strasburg, 9, 63
—— Triveth, 28
Noel, 170
Nominalism, 51 f.

Ockham, 161
Omnebene, 3
Opuscula, 15, 32, 38 ff., 59, 68, 160
Originality of St. Thomas, 121 ff., 126 f.
Origin of the *Summa*, 10 ff., 68 f.

Paquet, 58
Paris, Sojourn of St. Thomas in, 17 ff.; Second period, 29 ff.
—— University of, 6
Passions, 189 ff.
Patristic theology, 164 (see also Fathers)
Peckham, 99
Pègues, 58 f., 66
Pelster, Fr., 12
Pelzer, A., 12, 154
Perez, 54
Perrazzo, J. B., 165
Peter Aureoli, 161
—— Calo, 68
—— Cantor, 4
—— of Alvernia, 26, 69, 92
—— of Andria, 69
—— of Bergamo, 45, 141
—— of Capua, 5
—— of Ireland, 91, 151
—— of Poitiers, 3, 89
—— of Spain, 4, 91, 152
—— of Tarantasia, 80
—— Piscatoris, 49
—— the Lombard, 3, 11, 20, 44, 61, 89, 92, 93 ff., 101, 118
Philip of Grève, 7, 63, 80
—— of the Most Holy Trinity, 54, 65, 166
Philosophy, 167 ff., 171
Pignataro, 58
Piny, 134
Pius X, 57, 161 f.
—— XI, 57
Place of the *Summa Theologica* among the literary productions of St. Thomas, 15 ff.
Plato, 116
Politics, 172

Pope, Hugh, 165
Porphyry, 91
Portmann, A., 102
Prado, Norbert del, 58
Praepositinus, 5, 76, 81, 95, 96, 149
Prayer, 135 f.
"Princeps Thomistarum," 160
Proclus, 20
Profundity of the *Summa,* 131 f.
Prologus to the *Summa,* 60 ff., 65 ff., 70 ff., 88, 94, 128 f.
Prosper of Aquitaine, 2
Ptolemy of Lucca, 17, 20, 23, 25, 28, 44, 69, 93, 186
Purpose of the *Summa,* 67 ff.

Quaestio, 11 ff.
Quaestiones disputatae, 18, 28 f., 40 ff., 81 f., 92, 98 ff., 141
Quidort, 158
Quodlibeta, 11 f., 14, 16, 30 f., 98 f., 100 f., 160

Radulfus Ardens, 3, 5
—— Brito, 92
Ramberto dei Primadizzi, 69, 158
Raphael, 133
Raymond of Peñafort, 4, 15
Reding, 54
Reginald of Piperno, 26, 31, 69, 135
Reginaldus, A., 104
Repetitions, Avoidance of, 117 ff.
Richard Rufus, 89
Rietler, A., 114
Ripa, 65
Rivista di Filosofia, 170
Robert of Courçon, 4
—— of Melun, 3, 4, 61
—— of Tortocollo, 158
Roland-Gosselin, 170
Roland of Cremona, 8
Rolandus (Alexander III), 3, 4
Rufinus, 4
Ruiz de Montoya, 56
Ryan, J. A., 174

Sacraments, 209 ff.
Salmanticenses, 54
Satolli, 57, 66, 132
Schaub, Fr., 175
Schäzler, C. v., 103
Scheeben, M. J., 42, 54, 56, 97, 99, 162, 164
Schmaus, M., 159
Scholasticism, Golden age of, 6, 9, 66; Alliance with Humanism, 51 f.
Schwalm, 59.
Scotus, Duns, 158 f., 161
Scripture, Commentaries on, 11, 40, 92 f.
Sentences, Book of, see Peter the Lombard
Sententiae, 1 ff.
Serra, 65
Sic-et-non method, 79
Siger of Brabant, 30, 91, 152
Significance of the *Summa Theologica* in the *ensemble* of the literary productions of St. Thomas, 32 ff.
Silvester Maurus, 56
Simon of Tournai, 5, 76, 80, 149
Simplicius, 7, 27
Sin, 192
Sneek, C., 49

Socialism, 175
Sociology, 172, 174
Sombart, W., 174
Soteriology, 205 ff.
Soul, 184
Spann, O., 174
Spirit of the *Summa*, 60 ff.
States of life, 203 f.
Stephen of Tournai, 4
Stoppe, John, 49
Structure of the *Summa*, 178 ff.
Suarez, 55 f.
Suermondt, Cl., 37
Summa contra Gentiles, 15, 18, 19, 36 ff., 136
Summae, 1, 4 ff., 62 f., 150 f.
Supernatural, The, 163
Supplementum, 26
Sylvestris of Ferrara, 38, 131, 176
Sylvius, 54
Symbolism, 70
Systematization of the *Summa*, 88 ff., 94, 97, 101 f.
Szabò, S., 162

Tabarelli, 58
Tajus of Saragossa, 2
Tanner, 56
Tanquerey, 167
Teacher, St. Thomas as a, 67 ff., 130
Technique of the *Summa*, 75, 77 ff., 88 ff., 103 ff.
Themistius, 7
Theodorici, V., 49
Théry, G., 155
Thomasinus, 160
Thomas de Vallgornera, 166
—— of Sutton, 44, 46, 69, 158, 159, 160
Thomism, 171 ff.
Toletus, 53, 55
Torquemada, J. de, 51
Touron, A., 136
Trent, Council of, 57
Trinity, 109 f., 181 ff.
Tröltsch, E., 174

Ulric of Strasburg, 8, 63, 124, 155
Urban IV, 18 f.
Utilization of the *Summa*, 161 ff.

Vasquez, 56, 65
Vices, 192
Vielmius, J., 105
Vie Spirituelle, La, 167
Virgil, 116
Virtues, 77, 95, 123, 191 f., 195 ff.
Vita mixta, 204

Waffelaert, Bishop, 167
Walter, F., 175
Walz, A., 16
Werner, K., 23, 115
Wiggers, J. A., 56, 65, 72
Will, 188 ff.
William de la Mare, 122, 158
—— of Auxerre, 7, 75, 76, 95, 149
—— of Champeaux, 2
—— of Conches, 5
—— of Falgar, 99
—— of Moerbeke, 19, 20, 27, 39
—— of St. Amour, 18
—— of Tocco, 21 ff., 25 f., 69, 86, 126, 134, 135

—— Peraldus, 5
—— Petri de Godino, 44, 100
Wimpina, C., 49
"Witelo," 148

Xantes Mariales, 65

Ysambert, 56

Zamboni, G., 170
Zigliara, 141
Zumel, 54
Zybura, 168

208.67
G 752

2003

GRABMANN, Zybura

AUTHOR

Introduction to Theological
~~Summa of St. Thomas~~

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
		'AN APR 16 '7
		3 APR 16 '7
		CBPL
		6 '71
		2003

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

O'Connor Company
BOOKS-CHURCH GOODS
SAN FRANCISCO